



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:



- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Elizabeth B. A. Rathbun

1661



E. A. B. Dec 16. 1896.

THE CHURCH'S

BX
5148
.C56

MINISTRY OF GRACE

Lectures

DELIVERED IN 1892 UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE
CHURCH CLUB OF NEW YORK

WITH APPENDICES

NEW YORK
E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.
COOPER UNION, FOURTH AVENUE
1893


Eliz. A. Patterson
gt.
5-9-1923



Copyrighted, 1892,
By E. & J. B. YOUNG & Co.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LECTURE I.	
BAPTISM.....	3
<i>By the Rev. W. Clark, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, in Trinity College, Toronto, Canada.</i>	
LECTURE II.	
THE LORD'S SUPPER.....	39
<i>By the Rev. George McClellan Fiske, D.D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R.I.</i>	
LECTURE III.	
CONFIRMATION.....	131
<i>By the Very Rev. Wilford L. Robbins, D.D., Dean of All Saints' Cathedral, Albany, N. Y.</i>	
LECTURE IV.	
HOLY ORDERS	161
<i>By the Rt. Rev. Alex. Chas. Garrett, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Northern Texas.</i>	
LECTURE V.	
UNCTION, MATRIMONY, AND PENANCE.....	205
<i>By the Rt. Rev. Chas. C. Grafton, S.T.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac.</i>	



INTRODUCTION.

THE lectures contained in this volume are in continuation of those of 1891, which dealt with the fundamental truths of revealed religion as distinguished from those of natural religion, and were suggested by the last lecture in that course on "Grace and the Sacramental System ;" in truth these lectures are but an amplification of it, and it may be regarded as introductory to them.

The subjects treated in this volume under the general title of "The Church's Ministry of Grace," are Baptism, The Holy Eucharist, Confirmation, Holy Orders, Holy Matrimony, Penance, and Unction, that is to say, those two Sacraments which are stated in the Catechism to be generally necessary to salvation—Sacraments of the Gospel,

Greater Sacraments as they are sometimes called—and five Sacramental rites, or as they have been described, the ecclesiastical Sacraments, or sometimes also the five lesser Sacraments.

Whether they be called rites or Sacraments would seem to be a mere contention about words; as it cannot be denied that they are ordinances of God for the conveyance of spiritual grace, and that in the service for, or the administration of, each, an outward sign or form is prescribed or used and an inward grace spoken of.

If Saint Augustine's description of a Sacrament, referred to in the Homilies, be accepted, as comprising "a visible sign of an invisible grace," * the five rites may properly be called Sacraments; but if the outward sign must have been ordained by Christ Himself and expressly commanded in the New Testament, then only Baptism and the Eucharist are Sacraments.

* Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 374.

The XXV Article of Religion, following very ancient authority, accords special honor and pre-eminence to those two Sacraments which according to the Fathers flowed from the riven side of Christ, but does not deny that the other five, "commonly called Sacraments," are in some sense Sacraments, but only that they are Sacraments of the Gospel. The Article says of the five that they "have not the like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God." The difference between them and the two greater Sacraments, as laid down in the Article, does not relate to the inward grace but to the outward form. The Homilies, speaking of Absolution, point out the same distinction. We read in the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, "For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is

imposition of hands. For this visible sign, I mean, laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are." *

In the Homily against Swearing and Perjury, we read that "the Sacrament of Matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love,"† and in that on Common Prayer and Sacraments, referring to Ordination, that "neither it nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acception the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified."‡

Whether they be described as Sacraments or as Sacramental rites then, is a matter of definition and is immaterial, as they

* Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 376.

† Homily against Swearing and Perjury, p. 74.

‡ Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 377.

are grace-conveying ordinances by whatever term they may be called. To quote the language of the late Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, "It cannot be denied that seven ordinances have inclosed the whole Christian life in blessed bonds, not all necessary for all, nay, in the highest form of Christian life there is no room for matrimony; and in the first fervor of Christian love they were the exception who needed to be restored by the Sacrament of Penitence, but conveying according to men's needs the grace of which they are channels. They have ever been regarded to have a mystical significance of their own and separately from the beginning have existed as practices in the Church." *

Accordingly the Church's Ministry of Grace was selected as the title to this course of lectures, without the intention of affirming that there are no other instruments of grace known to the Church, or of denying that such practices as prayer and fasting are such

* Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 453.

instruments, but only that the latter, unlike the subjects treated in this volume, are not distinguished by any visible sign and therefore do not conform to the description of Saint Augustine.

Within the meaning of that description not only have the two Sacraments of the Gospel their visible signs, but the other five also have their own respective signs and impart grace effective to their several ends.

In Holy Baptism the form in the Anglican and the Roman communions is the same, "I baptize thee," etc. In the Greek Church the form is, "Be the servant of God baptized," etc. In the Anglican communion, Baptism is administered by immersion or pouring. In the Latin Church sprinkling is also allowed, while in the East immersion is the rule. The inward and invisible gift is regeneration. The matter is invariably water.

Baptism, like Confirmation and Orders,

can never be repeated, for the reason that it confers on the soul what is called character, meaning an ineffaceable mark. With the Holy Eucharist it is a Sacrament of necessity.

In the Holy Eucharist the matter is the bread and wine, and the form, in the Latin and English Churches at least, the words of institution. According to the doctrine of the Eastern Church, however, until a comparatively recent date, the change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ is effected not by the recitation of the words of institution, but by the Invocation of the Holy Ghost only.* Such, however, is not

* "We now come to the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, by which according to the doctrine of the Eastern Church and not by the words of institution, the bread and wine are 'changed,' 'transmuted,' 'transelemented,' 'transubstantiated' into our Lord's Body and Blood. This has always been a point of contention between the two churches—the time at which the change takes place. Originally, there is no doubt that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost formed a part of all liturgies. The Petrine has entirely lost it; the Ephesine (Gallican and Mozarabic) more or less retains it; as do also those mixtures of the Ephesine and Petrine, the Ambrosian and Patriarchine or Aquileian. To use the words of the authorized Russian Catechism: 'Why is this [the Invocation] so

the teaching of the West. The invocation probably never formed a part of the Petrine Liturgy and has disappeared from the canon in the present English use, although it has been restored in the Scottish and American rites.

All are agreed, however, that the consecration or change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, is effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit ; all sacerdotal power being derived from Him, the difference of opinion being as to whether it is necessary that the prayer to the Holy Ghost to bring about the change should be expressed, or whether it is sufficiently implied in reciting the words of institution.

essential ? Because at the moment of this act, the bread and the wine are changed or transubstantiated into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ. How are we to understand the word transubstantiation ? In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said that the word is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord ; for that none can understand but God ; but only this much is signified, that the bread, truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true ' Body of the Lord,' and the wine the very ' Blood of the Lord.' " *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies.* Neale and Littledale, p. 23, note.

Speaking of the Liturgy of the Church of England Canon Luckock says: "We may have a full conviction that the agency of the Holy Spirit is instrumental in producing the Sacramental change, and yet not deem the omission to express this conviction in the office fatal to its validity."*

In the East, "since what is known as 'the Moscow Controversy,' the principle has been accepted that consecration is effected by the combined use of both," so writes the same author.†

The inward and invisible gift is the Body and Blood of Christ.

The outward sign in Confirmation, in the Anglican Communion at least, is the imposition of hands and the words uttered by the Bishop as he lays his hands on the head of each candidate; and the inward grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost which is communicated to the recipients of the rite to confirm and

* The Divine Liturgy, p. 299, 2d ed.

† Ibid., p. 298.

strengthen them in faith and holy living. Confirmation confers both grace and character. As in Holy Orders the Holy Ghost gives special grace for the work of the ministry, so in Confirmation, grace for the ordinary work of the Christian life is given, in fact it has been described as a sort of ordination of the laity. In the East it still retains the primitive name of the Seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost.

In the Greek and in the Roman Church Confirmation is given with Unction, and in the former can be and is administered by Priests using the sacred chrism, or oil and balsam, that has been consecrated by the Bishop. Originally, in the very beginning, it would appear that it was given with the imposition of hands alone, but at a very early date the use of chrism was added, some say in the times of the Apostles themselves.

In the East, Confirmation is still administered immediately after Baptism, and was

not separated from it in the West until the seventh century.

Although the Anglican and the Roman Churches to-day consider the administration of this Sacrament inexpedient until children shall have reached the use of reason, they do not deny that Confirmation would in a spiritual sense edify infants as it did in the days of the Apostles.

It seems strange that there is no mention of Confirmation in the Catechism, but neither does it contain any instruction about the Bible, the Church, the Ministry, and other important and fundamental matters. The explanation is that the Catechism as we have it to-day even is an incomplete composition. It was begun under Edward VI. and was gradually enlarged and improved; the Commandments were inserted in 1552; and the section on the two greater Sacraments was added in 1604 and revised in 1662. And it is for this reason doubtless, that the Church in her Baptismal office instructs the Sponsors

to provide that the newly baptized learn not only the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and be instructed in the other parts of the Church Catechism, but also that he be taught "all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

The outward sign in Holy Orders is the laying on of the Bishop's hands and the words spoken by the Bishop at the imposition of his hands. The inward grace is authority to execute the office of deacon, the Holy Ghost* for the office and work of a

* "All sacerdotal power is derived from the Holy Ghost; the Church therefore holds that the reception of the Holy Ghost is necessary to constitute a Christian Priest, and that this gift can be conferred only through the hands of a Bishop. The priesthood is a grace of the Holy Spirit. . . . All the efficacy that there is in the administration of any ecclesiastical office depends wholly upon the co-operation of the Holy Ghost. 'Whether we preach, pray, baptize, communicate, condemn, give absolution, or whatsoever, as dispensers of God's mysteries, all words, judgments, acts, and deeds are not ours, but the Holy Ghost's' (Hooker's Eccl. Pol. b.v.c. lxxvii. 5, 8); and the gift is the spirit of power, of love and soberness, the spirit of confirmation, and of ghostly strength." *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*. Blunt. Revised and enlarged edition. Note, page 690.

Priest or of a Bishop in the Church of God, as the case may be. Holy Orders confer character as well as grace. Both the outward sign and the inward grace of this Sacrament are spoken of in the Bible. "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands,"* so writes Saint Paul to Saint Timothy. "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,"† and that to the first order alone, that is to the Bishops, as successors of the Apostles, belongs the power of ordination, and of perpetuating their own succession. With this ministry Our Lord has promised to be "even unto the end of the world."‡

In the office of Institution of Ministers we pray in these words: "O Holy Jesus, who hast purchased to Thyself an universal

* 2 Timothy i. 6.

† Preface to the Ordinal.

‡ S. Matthew xxviii. 20.

Church and hast promised to be with the ministers of Apostolic Succession to the end of the world ; Be graciously pleased to bless the ministry and service of him who is now appointed to offer the sacrifice of prayer and praise to Thee in this house, which is called by Thy Name. May the words of his mouth and the meditation of his heart be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our strength and our Redeemer. Amen."

The Church has most carefully guarded against the possibility of a break in this succession, and in very early times provided that there should be at least three Bishops to consecrate another to that office.*

Her practice, as well as her express enactments, show how essential the Church regards Episcopal Ordination to be. In the case of ministers of other religious bodies applying for admission to the Church's Ministry, the crucial question is whether they

*Canon iv. of Nicæsa. *Index Canonum*. Fulton, p. 123, 3d edition.

have been Episcopally ordained or not. It is not sufficient that they have been ordained by a man calling himself a Bishop, but their orders must have been conferred by a member of the Historic Episcopate or in other words by a Bishop having the Apostolic succession;* Roman and Greek Catholics so applying are not re-ordained, but are simply received upon giving satisfactory proof of their loyalty to our standards,† whereas a Presbyterian Minister, a Methodist Bishop, or an Irvingite Angel are received simply as laymen, and after a certain probation regulated by Canon are admitted to the lowest order of the Church's Ministry.‡

The outward sign § in Matrimony is the

* "And therefore to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." *Preface to the Ordinal.*

† *Vide* Title i., Canons 11 and 12.

‡ *Vide* Title i., Canon 2, § vii.

§ *Vide* Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. Blunt, p. 444, 2d edition.

consenting together of the man and the woman in holy wedlock, exhibited by giving and pledging their troth each to the other, and declared and illustrated, in the ritual of the Church, by giving and receiving a Ring, and by joining hands. The inward gift is grace to live faithfully together according to God's laws, and surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made. "The Sacrament of Matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love," * says the Church in her Homily on Swearing. The ancient view of Matrimony was that the holy bond could not be dissolved save by death. Saint Augustine even predicates of it an indelible character and frequently refers to it as a sacrament, as does also Saint Ambrose. Speaking of Marriage, Dr. Blunt writes : "It is not, however, only as a religious contract, but also as a Sacrament, that marriage is regarded by the Church of Christ ; the English Church numbering it among the five

* Homily against Swearing and Perjury, p. 74.

lesser Sacraments, which are necessary to particular states of life to which they refer, though not necessary for persons in general."* The Christian marriage in its mysterious union of two persons in body, soul, and spirit, symbolizes to us the mystical union that is between Christ and His Church.†

The modern and popular view of marriage is a lax one. It is neither a Sacrament nor a holy thing at all to the world, and is entered into lightly perhaps for the reason that its bond can be shaken off so easily.

Is it too much to hope that in the future, perhaps far off, the instinct of self-preservation, if no higher motive, will constrain society to return again to the old teaching on this most momentous subject and uphold the sanctity of marriage on her statute-books? Death alone terminates marriage. Adultery violates it.

Penance is variously called Confession,

* Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology, 2d edition, p. 444. † Book of Common Prayer, Marriage Service.

Absolution, the second Baptism, and the second Repentance. The outward sign is the words of the Priest when he absolves, and when the words of the Homily* in regard to the matter are observed, the laying on of hands, and the inward grace is the forgiveness of sins. This is promised in the most absolute terms by our Lord Himself. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained."† This power was given in the same way as the commission to preach the Gospel, the authority to baptize, to celebrate the Eucharist, and to teach.

The right of pronouncing absolution is by the Church strictly confined to an Episcopally ordained priesthood. The power to forgive sins is from above ; the dispenser of pardon is God, through His Son Jesus Christ,

* Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 377.

† S. John xx. 22, 23. *Vide* Form and Manner of Ordering Priests.

our great High Priest, but He chooses to impart it to His children through human agents, the Christian Priesthood, but no absolution of theirs is effectual without a true repentance and a firm resolve on the part of the penitent to lead a new life. God acts here as in so many other ordinances through human agents and material channels. This is the essence of sacerdotalism, namely that it is God's rule to work by the use of means. The Church's system is sacerdotal as well as sacramental. The relation between pastor and flock is, in the letter of institutions in the office of Institution of a Minister in the Prayer Book, declared to be of a sacerdotal character.

In the early Church Penance was administered publicly. The XXXIII Article of Religion prescribes Penance as the mode of reconciling an excommunicated person to the Church.

With us confession of sins to a Priest is not compulsory and is not a prerequisite to

the reception of the Holy Communion, but it is a privilege which the Church extends to those of her children who seek it, and it is their right who desire it. The Church allows a wide liberty in this matter, and in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. inserted these words in one of the Exhortations in the Communion office, "requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the Priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences particularly to open their sins to the Priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences, when as he hath no warrant of God's word to the same."

The outward sign in Unction is oil and the words used by the Priest when he anoints the sick person, and the inward grace is the forgiveness of sins and the raising of the sick man to health, if not of the body at least of soul.

Unction has been called the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament. Its administration was provided for in the first English Prayer Book. The rubric in the office for the Visitation of the Sick directed the Priest, if the sick person desired it, to "Anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross," using these words, "As with this visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed, so our heavenly father, Almighty God, grant of His infinite goodness, that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness; and vouchsafe for His great mercy (if it be His blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength, to serve Him; and send thee release

of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And howsoever His goodness (by His divine and unsearchable providence) shall dispose of thee, we, His unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the eternal majesty to do with thee according to the multitude of His innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sins and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnal affections; who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength, by his Holy Spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversaries, that in no wise he prevail against thee, but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the devil, sin, and death through Christ our Lord; Who by His death hath overcome the prince of death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost evermore liveth and reigneth God, world without end. Amen." But all this was removed in the second book, and although everything in the earlier book was

commended by the compilers of the later, the service for the anointing of the sick has never been restored to its place in the Prayer Book. The rite is in use among the Nestorians and Armenians and all the Orientals as well as among the Orthodox Greeks and the Latins, although among the latter it has been diverted from its original purpose and to-day is only administered, in the Roman Church, when the sick man is *in extremis* and all hope of recovery is past. It may be because of this misuse of the ordinance that all provision for its administration was dropped out of the Prayer Book; perhaps on the ground that its perversion from its original purpose constituted "a corrupt following of the Apostles;" but because a practice has been abused is no good reason that it should therefore cease to be used, but rather that the abuses should be reformed and the practice continued.

The practice is distinctly scriptural and is

founded on S. James v. 14, 15: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he hath committed sins they shall be forgiven him." "The visitation of the sick is not, therefore, in the minister of Christ a mere piece of civility or neighborly kindness, but an act of religion. He comes in the name of Christ to pray with and for the sick man; if necessary to reconcile him to the Church by the blessing of absolution, and to communicate to him the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood."*

The fact of the agreement of all the historic Churches, schismatics and orthodox alike, on this subject of the sacramental use of oil in anointing the sick, goes to show

* *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*. Blunt. Enlarged and revised edition, p. 460. *Vide* also Order for the Visitation of the Sick in the English Prayer Book.

that the practice must have been known to the Church from the beginning, and that the Church of England acted consistently with her declared principle, a strict adherence to antiquity, in retaining in her first English Prayer Book a service for the administration of this Apostolic rite, and that by its omission a primitive and Apostolic practice has been practically lost to the Church.

Unction, however, has never been considered necessary to salvation, but it is rather looked upon as a privilege of the faithful.

It is believed that these lectures cannot fail to prove useful to all thoughtful readers, not only because of the high ability of those who, at the invitation of the Church Club, consented to deliver them, Professor Clark, Dr. Fiske, Dean Robbins, and Bishops Garrett and Grafton, but also for the reason that in them the teaching of the Church on the subject of the two great Sacraments of the Gospel is clearly stated, as well as her

position in regard to those other means of grace, which, although not Sacraments of the Gospel and not generally necessary to salvation, are still "commonly called Sacraments."

In them the two great propositions that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God,"* and "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,"† are clearly brought out.

Baptism and the Holy Eucharist must ever stand out pre-eminent. They alone are generally necessary to salvation, and correspond in the New Dispensation to what Circumcision and the Passover were to Israel of old. Of them alone it is recorded that Christ ordained their outward signs as symbols and vehicles of their inward graces.

It is not contended that all men should take holy orders, nor yet that all persons should marry, or practise auricular confession

* S. John iii. 5.

† S. John vi. 55.


either habitually or even occasionally. Unc-tion has never been thought necessary to sal-vation, but has rather been regarded as a privilege to be extended to those of the faith-ful who desire it.

It must be borne in mind, however, that because these rites are not necessary it by no means follows that they are not impor-tant. Confirmation was administered to all by the Apostles, acting, it is reasonably inferred, under the instructions of Our Lord, given after His resurrection, and was certainly by them considered to be of vital importance, and has been so regarded by their successors ever since. For worldly success it is not absolutely essential that a man should be educated, he need not know how to read or write even, or yet to speak, hear, or see, but it will not be gainsaid that these are things that a man would be sorry to be compelled to go through life without.

So with these five rites, as has been said before, although "not all necessary for all,"

they convey "According to men's needs the grace of which they are channels" and have "from the beginning existed as practices in the Church ;" and since in these lectures the position and proper use of each, as well as the fact that they constitute an integral part of our inheritance as Churchmen are pointed out, it is believed that the volume will prove not only of great practical value to the sons and daughters of our communion, but it is hoped will also serve a useful purpose in setting out clearly before those not in communion with us, who may be striving to comprehend our system, the Church's attitude toward these matters.

Holy Baptism.



LECTURE I.

BY WILLIAM CLARK, M.A. OXON.,
Hon. LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.

HOLY BAPTISM.

THE work of grace, the work of God on behalf of the sinful race of man, is one work, although it has been carried on "at sundry times and in divers manners." It culminates in the work of Christ and in the organization of the Christian Church ; and these two things are inseparable. The work which Christ did upon earth He accomplished in order that God the Holy Ghost might dwell with men upon the earth. The Church was organized on the Day of Pentecost, in order that the work of Christ might be carried on by the Spirit. To make any attempt to separate these two parts of Divine revelation and working is an indication of a profound misunderstanding of the purpose of God, and must lead to most injurious consequences.

It is generally agreed among those who call themselves by the name of Christ that the work

of the Church cannot be separated from that of its Founder; but it is not so generally recognized that the work which Christ is now doing in the world is carried on by the Holy Spirit working through the organism of the Church. And yet this is the simple truth of the matter. We are no longer mere disciples of Christ, listening to His teaching, obeying His commands, fulfilling His will. It is true, indeed, that this relation to our Master will never cease. But we have, since the day of Pentecost, come into a closer relationship to Him; we are now members of His Body, branches in that mystical Vine of which He is the trunk; and it is in the thorough recognition of this connexion that we shall be able to understand the significance of the Church's ministry of grace, and the place and power of the sacraments.

It is for want of keeping these considerations in view that many sincere and earnest Christian people have fallen into serious error with respect to the Sacrament of Baptism, and have even denounced as heretical that which has been the doctrine of the Church from the very beginning of her history. If Baptism were a mere rite of initiation, a mere badge of discipleship, a mere external act that is to say, then it would be unintelligible that it should be described by the language which we find in the Bible and in the Prayer Book alike; but Baptism is more than this.

Ceremonies similar in their outward form to Christian Baptism have been in use, and have had some part of the meaning of this great ordinance. Water has always been a symbol of life and of cleansing. An ancient philosopher made it to be the principle of all existence. Under the law there were many ceremonial washings, by which certain kinds of impurities were supposed to be removed. It is even said, although there is no absolute proof of the custom, that proselytes were received, by baptism, from other religious systems. At any rate it was in this way that S. John the Baptist enrolled those disciples who came to him to be taught the way of righteousness and to be prepared for the coming of the Messiah.

But Baptism was instituted by our Lord with a deeper meaning, as a means not merely of enrolling men among the disciples of Jesus Christ, but of grafting them into the mystical vine and giving them organic connexion with the Church which is the Body of the Lord. It is hardly necessary to insist upon the proof of these elementary statements. It will be sufficient to note that one aspect of the subject is presented in our Lord's commission (S. Matt. xxviii. 19): "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," whilst the other is embodied in the words of S. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 13),

“For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body.”

These things are not denied by any who believe that the sacraments are of perpetual obligation. There never has been a time since the day of Pentecost when an unbaptized man has been regarded as a member of the Church of Christ, or a baptized man has been regarded as other than a member. The nature and significance of Christian Baptism must therefore depend upon the nature of the Church of Christ and the meaning of the relations constituted by the act of baptism.

That our Lord Jesus Christ came into this world not merely to preach a Gospel, but to found a spiritual Society has become a commonplace with teachers of every school of thought. Just as the Eternal Word in the Incarnation took upon Him man's nature, and dwelt in our flesh as in a tabernacle; so did the Holy Ghost come down on the day of Pentecost and build for Himself a spiritual temple in which He might dwell and reign, an habitation of God through the Spirit. This gift of the Comforter was made once for all. He could not be given until Jesus had been glorified, until the Second Adam had sat down upon His mediatorial throne; but after He had gone away from the earth, He fulfilled His promise to send to His people another Comforter who should abide with them for ever.

Keeping these simple facts in view, we shall find little difficulty in understanding the descriptions of the Church which are found in the apostolic epistles. Let us begin with what we may call the classical utterance of S. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 22, 23) in which he says that Christ is "Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Here we have two things asserted, first, the intimate union between Christ and His Church, and secondly, that He has communicated all His fulness to the Church. We know that "in Him," in Christ Himself (Coloss. ii. 9) "dwell-eth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." S. John declares (i. 16) that "of His fulness we all received, and grace for grace"; and now we are told that the Church is His Body, "the fulness"—it is the same word which is employed in speaking of Christ Himself—"the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." And the plain meaning of these words is borne out by what is elsewhere said concerning the Church, since it is described as the "Temple of God" (1 Cor. iii. 16), the "Temple of the living God" (2 Cor. vi. 16); and "a Habitation of God in the Spirit" (Ephes. ii. 22).

It is, moreover, quite clear that these expressions are applied to the visible society of Christians in the world. From the day of Pentecost, when the followers of Christ ceased to be a

mere company of disciples and became an organized unity, we have constant mention made of the Church in a new and peculiar sense. It is everywhere the Church which is increased, the Church which is persecuted, the Church which is edified.

And this Church is no mere abstraction, nor is it a name applied to the number of elect souls existing within the body of the professing society.

Every reference in the Acts of the Apostles shows clearly that this Church is the visible body of Christians, the number of those who profess the faith of Christ and are baptized into His name. And it is the same in the Epistles. Thus S. Paul, writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 27), says: "Ye are the Body of Christ, and severally members thereof." It would be impossible to be more explicit. It is said not merely of the community at large that they form part of the mystical Body, but the same is declared of each member in particular. If it is said that this teaching involves consequences which are at variance with other parts of sacred Scriptures, it may suffice for the present to say that these inferences will not be overlooked.

If, now, we have grasped the idea of the Church as it is presented to us in the New Testament, we shall have no difficulty in understanding the nature of that Act by which we are made members of this spiritual organism ; and we shall see that the

teaching of the Anglican formularies is, on the one hand, a mere exposition of the new relations into which the baptized have entered by becoming members of the Church of Christ, whilst, on the other hand, it is entirely justified by the language of the New Testament.

What is the teaching of our formularies? It is based upon our relation to Adam and to Christ. In the first Adam men fell and were lost, in the second Adam they were raised and saved. By our natural birth we become members of the sinful race of man, we are made children of Adam. With the recognition of this fact our baptismal service commences; "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin." Such a state is a hopeless state. The only hope for man is in union with the Second Adam, and this union is effected by baptism into His mystical Body, the Church. The baptized child is no longer a member of Adam, it is a member of Christ. It is no longer one of a condemned race, it is brought into a pardoned community. It is taken out of the wild olive in which it grew by nature, and grafted into the true Vine, which is Christ. It is removed from the merely human family into which it was introduced by its natural birth, and brought into the family of God through Jesus Christ.

Here is no mechanical, magical act, by which the nature of a human being is thought to be

radically changed. It is a spiritual act by which a new position and new relations are constituted, and new privileges are conferred.

There is nothing unreasonable or difficult of belief in this teaching rightly understood. For, let it be observed, it is not asserted that the child was personally sinful or guilty before its baptism, and that its sinful heart is changed in or by that Sacrament. Personal sin and personal guilt can be attributed only to those who are conscious and responsible beings. When, therefore, we speak of a great change being effected in baptism, it is not intended to imply that the bad child has been made a good child, or that any miracle has been wrought in the moral disposition of the child baptized, or that it has experienced a change like that which takes place in an adult who is converted from sin to God. It is meant simply that, whereas the child was formerly a member of the sinful family of Adam, and therefore possessed only natural powers, privileges, and prospects, it is now brought into union with Christ, made a Member of the Church "which is His body," of that body to which the Holy Ghost was sent that He might dwell in it forever, and which, for that reason, is called the "Temple of the living God" and "a habitation of God in the Spirit."

A glance at our formularies will show how clearly all this is recognized in their language.

Thus, in the baptismal service, after the rite has been administered, we affirm that the child is "regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," and again, in the prayer which follows, "We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy Church."

To the same purpose in the Catechism every baptized child is taught to speak of his baptism as that in which he "was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven," and to thank his heavenly Father for having called him "to this state of salvation through Jesus Christ our Saviour." So in the "Order of Confirmation" the baptismal standing is assumed throughout the service, and it is expressly stated of those who come to Confirmation that God had "vouchsafed to regenerate these" His "servants by water and the Holy Ghost," and had "given unto them forgiveness of all their sins."

The same doctrine is taught in the Articles. Thus, in the twenty-seventh Article, we read: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth,

whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church ; the promises of forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." To the same effect are the contents of the ninth Article, "Of Original and Birth-Sin," and of the sixteenth, "Of Sin after Baptism." It will be quite clear, from an examination of these documents, that there is no foundation whatever for the assertion that the teaching of the Articles differs from that of the Catechism. Such a notion must be the result either of a hasty and superficial examination of the formularies themselves, or else of an imperfect acquaintance with theological language.

It is time, however, to inquire a little further whether these views are sustained by the teaching of the New Testament. To some extent this question has already been answered in our exposition of the nature of the Church of Christ. If the Church is the Body of Christ, the Family of God, the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and if baptism introduces men into that Church, then it cannot be a mistake to speak of the baptized person being thus made a "member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven."

Take another view of the matter. It is generally agreed among all who use baptism, that is to say, nearly all Christian people except those who are

called Friends or Quakers, that baptism is the sign of the Christian Covenant, just as circumcision made men members of the Covenant body under the earlier dispensation. Now, what is the meaning of the Christian Covenant, and what are the privileges which it secures to men? The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 10, 12), quoting from the prophet Jeremiah (xxxi. 33), answers this question: "This is the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people . . . and their sins will I remember no more." It is apparent that the blessings spoken of in this passage are just those which in the baptismal services are attributed to the baptized child, namely, the gift of the Holy Spirit, who writes the law upon the heart, adoption into God's family, and the pardon of sin. These are considerations which should receive special attention from that large class of Christians who are ready to acknowledge the covenant privileges of the children of Christian parents, and yet feel objections to the language employed by the Church to denote those privileges. And perhaps these remarks may help to prepare us for an examination of the direct Scripture testimony to the doctrine of Baptism.

Let us, under this head, notice first the two

principal texts which directly and distinctly connect Regeneration with the Sacrament of Baptism; one in the words of our Blessed Lord, S. John iii. 5; the other in those of S. Paul, Titus iii. 5. In the first we read: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." For about fifteen hundred years there was no difference of opinion as to the meaning and application of these words. The birth of water was ever explained to mean the Sacrament of Baptism. S. Justin Martyr, the first writer who quotes the text, and one who wrote within forty years of the death of S. John, so interprets it. Not only so, but he and all who succeed him connect the birth of the Spirit with the birth of water. Multitudes of testimonies to the same effect might easily be quoted. In fact there is no difference of opinion. This consensus could not be better expressed than in the words of Hooker (Eccl. Pol. v. 59, 3): "To hide the general consent of antiquity agreeing in the literal interpretation, they cunningly affirm that 'certain' have taken those words as meant of material water, when they know that of all the ancient there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise expound or allege the place than as implying external baptism."

It is difficult to argue against the prejudice which refuses to accept this meaning of the words.

It can hardly be denied that it is the literal and grammatical meaning. It is also, beyond all doubt, the historical meaning; and it is a meaning which adapts itself to all the other texts which bear upon the same subject, and is contradicted by none of them. The author of *Ecce Homo*, who cannot be suspected of any special reverence for ecclesiastical or patristic authority, points out unhesitatingly that our Lord made the "declaration that there was no way into the Theocracy, but through Baptism. The Kingdom of God, He insisted . . . was a true state. . . . Those who would enroll themselves among the citizens of it were to understand that they began their life anew, as truly as if they had been born again. And . . . the initiatory rite of baptism with its publicity and formality, was pronounced as indispensable to membership as that spiritual inspiration which is membership itself." These words are of course inadequate if regarded as representing the Catholic doctrine of Baptism, but they do at least recognize distinctly the plain connexion, implied and expressed in the words of our Lord, between the Sacrament of Baptism and entrance into the Kingdom.

But perhaps it is necessary to refer to one objection, which has some appearance of validity, to the effect that these words of our Lord could not refer to baptismal regeneration, seeing that the

Holy Ghost, the Regenerator, was not yet given. The force of the objection is apparent. The Church was not constituted when these words were spoken, and the Holy Ghost was not dwelling among men : and therefore there could be no admission into the Church and no grafting into that spiritual organism of which the Holy Ghost was the life. Yet a moment's consideration will show the invalidity of the argument. If Regeneration were a mere mechanical act, tied to the Sacrament of Baptism, then the objection would have weight. But we have already seen that it is only one out of several aspects of the change which passes upon those who are removed from a state of nature to a state of grace, who are grafted into the Church of Christ, which is His mystical Body. Now, we might say that, in the same sense that there was at the time these words were spoken no regeneration, in that sense there was as yet no Kingdom. The descent of the Holy Ghost was the evidence of the constitution of the mediatorial Kingdom of Christ, was the organization of the Church of Christ on earth ; and those who by baptism were received into that spiritual system, either after the descent of the Holy Ghost or by anticipation before that day, at one and the same moment became members of the Church, subjects of the Kingdom and partakers of the heavenly gift. Before the day of Pentecost the blessings of the

new Covenant were theirs potentially. After the descent of the Holy Ghost they were theirs actually. So far as the Kingdom of God could be said to have come when those words were uttered, so far the baptized man entered it and enjoyed its blessings. When the fulness of time had come and the promised Gift was poured out, then he could enter into the fulness of his heritage.

Let us, then, turn to the second of the two principal texts, Titus iii. 5. "According to His mercy He saved us, through the washing [or laver] of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Perhaps the substitution of *laver* for *washing* brings out better the reference to the baptismal font ; but it makes no great difference. As regards the meaning of this passage there is no diversity of opinion whatever among the writers of the early Church, and it is used in the early Liturgies with this meaning. Even Calvin admits the reference to baptism in this passage, summing up its meaning in these words : "God has saved us by His mercy, of which salvation He has given us a sign and pledge in baptism, receiving us into His Church and grafting us into the Body of His Son."

If these are the only passages which refer to Baptism as the instrument of Regeneration directly and precisely, there are other texts which teach the same doctrine in different forms. We

need do little more than quote the words without arguing for the meaning which they convey. Take first those which declare that Baptism is the instrument of our engrafting into Christ. Begin with Galatians iii. 27, 28, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus." Note how the revised version of the first sentence brings out with greater distinctness the reference to the moment of baptism and the consequences which resulted from it.

Take next 1 Corinthians xii. 13. "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit." Of course it may be urged that there is here simply a reference to a baptism of the Spirit without any reference to the Sacrament; and, if the words stood by themselves, it might be difficult, or even impossible to decide the reference; but the connexion between these words and those just quoted from the Epistle to the Galatians is so clear that it is hardly possible to doubt their application.

Or again, on this point, take Romans vi. 3, 4, and connect with this passage Colossians ii. 12, and Ephesians iv. 5. "Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were

baptized into His death ? We were buried therefore with Him through baptism into death." It is possible that there may be here an allusion to the mode of baptism by immersion ; but this is by no means certain ; and in any case it does not exhaust the meaning of the passage. The teaching of the text is the same which we have found elsewhere, namely, that Baptism is the instrument of our engrafting into Christ ; but that, being engrafted, we are members of one who died and was buried and rose again, and therefore we are participators in His death, His burial, and His resurrection. If we are admitted into the mystical Body of Christ, then we are united to Christ Himself. If we are united to Christ, then we are united to Christ crucified, dead, buried, ascended. Whatever He did, He did on our behalf. And into all that He did we enter, when we are united to Him.

Another set of texts connects the Sacrament of Baptism with the forgiveness of sin and salvation. Thus, even S. John the Baptist preached the baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins ; but when the Day of Pentecost was come, then something more certain and more definite was assured to those who rightly received this Sacrament : " Repent and be baptized, that your sins may be blotted out." And how ? Simply by their reception into the Covenant body. Personal

repentance sufficed for personal forgiveness ; but baptism was the means by which they passed over from the world to the Church, from the order of nature to the order of grace. All this is implied in the declaration, " He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

To the same effect are the words spoken to S. Paul after his conversion : " Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins " (Acts xxii. 16). These would be very surprising words, if we accepted the theory that all that is needed is repentance and faith in order to a perfect Christian life. When these words were spoken to Saul of Tarsus, he was already what we should call a converted man. He was a believer in Jesus as the Messiah, the Saviour of the world. And yet he is told that he must now, still, wash away his sins in baptism. There is no shadow of difficulty in understanding these words if we accept the Church doctrine of Baptism, and there is no possibility of explaining them, as far as we have heard or can imagine, if we reject that doctrine. When those words were spoken, S. Paul was a penitent and a believer, but he was not yet a member of the Covenant Body, and he could not be a member until he was united to it by Baptism. But until then he did not belong to the number, the community of the adopted, the pardoned, the regenerate. When he was baptized, he would then be a member of

Christ, as a part of His mystical Body, and therefore he would receive the remission of sins in Him. In the same way we may explain the words of S. Peter (1 Peter iii. 21): "Water, which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." There are difficulties in the passage, but the reference to baptism and the meaning of the reference are clear enough. The power of the new life is the resurrection of Jesus Christ. His resurrection was the regeneration of mankind. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . according to His great mercy begat us again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Peter i. 3). Now, Baptism is the means by which we are united to Jesus Christ risen, and thus made partakers of His risen life which is salvation. Therefore we may say that Baptism doth save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Yet this salvation cannot be our own by a mere external washing. There must be the correspondence of a good conscience within. For the new heart and the right spirit, the spirit of faith and hope and love, this alone is salvation.

It would be easy to enlarge these remarks by discussing the various theories which have been put up in opposition to the Catholic doctrine; but

perhaps enough has been said to put the student on the right track for following out the bearings of the doctrine ; and it may be more useful to give a brief historical view in regard to the doctrine of Baptism as held in the different ages of the Church.

Let us begin with the writers of the first three centuries of the Church, and first with the Apostolic Fathers. The writer of the homily formerly known as the second epistle of S. Clement of Rome, has words (chap. vi.) which plainly imply the doctrine. "How," he asks, "can we hope to enter into the royal palace of God unless we keep our baptism holy and undefiled?" S. Barnabas (chap. xi.) says, "This meaneth that we descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear of God and trust in Jesus in our spirit."

We pass on to Justin Martyr. One out of several passages teaching substantially the same doctrine will suffice. It is from the longer apology, chap. lxi. Speaking of Christian converts he says: "Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated." The whole chapter should be read, and there are other passages in his writings to the same effect. So S. Clement of Alexandria (*Pædagog.* i. 6, 26) affirms that "in being baptized we are enlightened, in be-

ing enlightened we are adopted, in being adopted we are made perfect." We might quote Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian to the same effect, but these may suffice as primitive testimonies.

The doctrine of the Eastern Church may be seen from the office for Holy Baptism* in which after baptism it is said, "Thou hast now vouchsafed a new birth to Thy servant of late illuminated through water and the Spirit, and hast granted him remission of his voluntary and involuntary sins;" and from the Great Catechism† in which baptism is pronounced to be "a mystery by which, when the body is washed in water, the soul of the believer is cleansed from sins by the blood of Christ," with much more to the same effect.

A single extract from the Catechism of the Council of Trent (Sacraments, chap. ii. 25) will serve to show the Roman doctrine of Baptism. "It follows that Baptism may be accurately and appositely defined to be the 'Sacrament of Regeneration by water in the word.'"

It is probable that these testimonies will have but little influence with those whom we have in mind. It ought, however, to be more to our purpose to show that the teaching of the other reformed Communions do not in this respect differ from our own; and although, as we shall see, there is one important difference between the teaching

* Littledale, *Offices*, pp. 26, 146.

† London (1867), p. 26.

of the Anglican formularies and the Calvinistic Confessions, this difference has reference not to the meaning of the ordinance, but to the extent of its application and effect. The reformers with one voice connected the blessing of Regeneration with the Sacrament of Baptism, as a few extracts from the various confessions will clearly show.

We begin with the Helvetic Confession (chap. xx.): "*Obsignantur hæc omnia baptismo. Nam intus regeneramur, purificamur, et renovamur a Deo per Spiritum Sanctum : foris autem accipimus obsignationem maximorum donorum in aqua, qua etiam maxima illa beneficia representantur, et veluti oculis nostris conspicienda proponuntur.*" The Augsburg Confession (chap. ix.) teaches thus: "*De Baptismo docent, quod necessarius sit ad salutem, tanquam ceremonia a Christo instituta. Et quod per Baptismum offeratur gratia Dei : et quod Infantes sint baptizandi : et quod Infantes per Baptismum Deo commendati, recipiantur in gratiam Dei, et fiant Filii Dei, sicut Christus testatur.*" In the Saxon Confession (chap. xiv.) we read: "*In hujus veri Dei nomen, id est invocationem, te baptizo . . . et certo statues tibi tribui beneficia quæ in Evangelio promisit, te esse membrum Ecclesiæ Dei, quæ per Filium redempta est, et sanctificatur a Spiritu Sancto.*"

Leaving the foreign Confessions, from others of which testimonies equally strong and clear might

be adduced, we turn to the Confession agreed upon by the Presbyterians and Independents of England, at Westminster, and since adopted by the various Presbyterian Churches throughout the English-speaking world. In chap. xxviii. of the Westminster Confession it is written: "Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the Covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of the remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." The same is taught in the larger and shorter Catechisms.

There is, therefore, as we have said, no difference in any of these Confessions, Roman, Greek, Anglican, Protestant, Lutheran, Calvinistic, as to the essential meaning and significance of the Sacrament of Baptism; but there is, in some of the Calvinistic Confessions, an important reservation which we must not disregard. According to these authorities the blessings of baptism are bestowed only upon the elect. The Westminster Confession, for example, declares (chap. xxviii., sect. 5) that we have no right to say that "all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated," and (in the following section) that "the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the

Holy Ghost, *to such as that grace belongeth to, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time.*" Such a reservation was inevitable on the part of those who held the theories of special individual election and indefectible grace. If grace once given can never finally be lost, then we must either believe that all baptized persons will be saved, or else that some persons do not receive grace in baptism. It is hardly necessary to add that, whatever may be the truth as regards the mystery of predestination, there is no pretence of any ground in Scripture for this limitation of the application of the blessings of Baptism.

But here we are met by certain questions which demand an answer, and first, that which concerns the subjects of baptism and more particularly the question of the baptism of infants. This is, of course, a large subject, and cannot be treated satisfactorily in this place; yet there are some considerations which may be suggested which, by being followed out, may give us something like moral certainty on this point.

By the opponents of Infant Baptism it is urged that if children are joined to the mystical Body of Christ, then they become Christians unconsciously, and secondly, that there is no authority for the baptism of infants in the New Testament. With regard to the first of these difficulties, it is perhaps sufficient to point out that there is no more diffi-

culty about explaining the fact of a child's becoming, in a state of unconsciousness, a member of Christ, than his becoming a member of Adam in the same manner. If our natural birth is something in which we have no conscious part, then it does not seem unreasonable that it should be the same with our spiritual birth. And perhaps so much may suffice on that point.

With regard to the absence of Scripture testimony, it is very difficult to see how any such authority could be given in the New Testament which might not be evaded by those who were disinclined to receive it. Let it be remembered that there is very little in the way of bare precept in the New Testament. As a rule, it is simply principles which are enunciated, and the Church and the individual Christian are left to apply them according to their circumstances and their needs. For example, there is nothing at all said about the religious use of the Lord's Day, yet most Christians consider it obligatory upon them to have a special mode of observing that day.

It will appear, however, as we believe, that to a careful and candid reader of the New Testament there is a great deal which favours the baptism of infants, and constrains us to believe that such a custom is in accordance with the mind of Christ.

When our Lord says, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not," we

cannot, of course, maintain that these words require that children should be baptized, yet they seem naturally to suggest that they should not be excluded from discipleship, and therefore that they should be admitted to the membership of the Church.

When S. Peter on the day of Pentecost summoned his kindred of the seed of Abraham to accept the Messiah and to become subjects of His Kingdom, he certainly appeared to include young children in the offer. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts ii. 38, 39). It is quite possible that "children" here might mean descendants, but we do not think that such is the natural meaning of the word. Should we be likely thus to interpret the expression, if we had no preconceived opinion to maintain? And, in short, if we are to explain away the natural sense of the Apostle's statement, what argument for the baptism of children could be imagined that would suffice?

It would have seemed a strange thing to the Israelite to be told that his children could have no interest in the covenant the full blessings of which could now for the first time be realized. For, in

point of fact, they were already included in the Covenant of faith. The Covenant of Christ was a new covenant, if compared with the law of Moses ; but it was also the same Covenant which was made with Abraham. This is plainly taught in the Epistle to the Galatians. The Law was a mere parenthesis, so to speak, introduced for special reasons, to prepare for the Gospel of Christ, to bring out man's need of redemption and the like ; but the Covenant of Christ was a covenant of faith as that of Abraham was ; and it would be strange indeed that children under the Law might be members of the Covenant, and under the Gospel they might not. But the case would be even worse than this. For, according to the theory that children cannot be members of the Church of Christ, we should have to believe that the members of a Jewish family were in Covenant with God so long as the Gospel of Christ was unknown to them, but the moment that the parents received Christian baptism, the children lost their place in the covenant body. They would be no longer members of the Jewish commonwealth, and the Church of Christ has shut its doors upon them. Surely it needs no texts of Scripture to render any such theory impossible of belief to those who have entered into the spirit of the Gospel of Christ.

The practice of the Apostles, as far as we know

it, entirely harmonizes with the view that not the heads of families alone were received into the Church. The baptism of three thousand on the Day of Pentecost is an event which could not have happened, if the Apostles had held the theory of modern Baptists. The baptism of whole families, even if there were no children in them, which is not very likely, is equally unintelligible, if only those are to be baptized who are the subjects of conscious and established faith in Christ. Moreover, in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians, which are addressed "to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," and "to the saints and faithful brethren which are at Colosse," among other classes addressed there are children, evidently young children still in a position of dependence upon their parents, who are yet regarded as baptized, as Christians, as members of the Church.

As regards early * testimony we may remark generally that there is nothing against the practice of infant baptism. Even Tertullian, when advocating the postponement of baptism, proves that infant baptism was customary in his days, and he does not suggest that it is an innovation. His reason for wishing to put it off was the danger of post-baptismal sin. "That infant bap-

* Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, i, 2, 5.

tism was customary in Tertullian's time is proved by his opposition to it."*

All the other early testimonies are to the same effect. Thus Justin Martyr† testifies: "Many, both men and women, of sixty and seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ from childhood, remain uncorrupted." The word "made disciples" is the same which occurs in our Lord's commission to the Apostles, as recorded by St. Matthew, and undoubtedly refers to the enrolment of these children into the Church of Christ.

To this we may add the testimony of Irenæus.‡ His words are, "For He came to save all by Himself; all, I say, who through Him are born again (*renascuntur*) to God; infants and little ones and boys and young persons and older persons (*infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores*)." Here there can be no doubt as to the classes intended; and as regards the meaning of the word *renascuntur* there can hardly be a difference of opinion. Not only does it naturally suggest the idea of baptism in this passage, but this is the almost universal usage of the writer. Both Neander and Gieseler, who are the most impartial

* The importance of the appeal to history is now generally recognized. Tradition, if real, is of the highest value. We do not reject the modern doctrines of the Church of Rome because they appeal to tradition; but because they are not supported by tradition. They are innovations. It has been truly said that "the true criticism of a dogma is its history"; and if we find that our interpretations of Scripture are unsupported by primitive testimony, we may well suspect their validity.

† Longer Apology, chap. xv.

‡ *Adversus Hæreses*, ii. 39.

witnesses, assert that in this place the word can be understood only of baptism.* Here then we have not only a testimony to infant baptism in the second century, but also an assertion of baptismal regeneration.

In speaking of the doctrine of the Protestant Confessions, we remarked that some of them limited the grace of baptism to those who were elected or predestinated to eternal life. It is not necessary that we should discuss a theory which few in these days would maintain.

Whatever Baptism does, it does for all who rightly receive it; and as children can place no bar to the operation of the grace of the sacrament, it is not merely a matter of faith, but a matter of common sense, to say that every baptized child is, in the act of baptism, grafted into the mystical Body of Christ.

Other forms of this hypothetical theory of Baptismal Regeneration have been put forward and abandoned, so that they need not further detain us. But it may be useful to note two things concerning these theories as being of some practical importance. On the one hand, we note a strange error into which those have fallen who think that this doctrine interferes with the sufficiency of the work of Christ and, on the other hand, it has been strangely charged with leading

* Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 3. Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, i.

to the undervaluing of the obligation of personal religion.

The former of these errors has already been virtually disposed of. Baptism could be of no value at all but for the work of Redemption accomplished by the grace of God. The gift of Christ, the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, the sacrifice of the Son of God upon the cross, here is the foundation of man's hope of safety; and this is the outcome of the love of God our heavenly Father. But further, when the blessings of the work of redemption were to be extended to all mankind, it was the will of God that this should be done by means of that supernatural society, the Church of Christ, which was on the Day of Pentecost, organized by the presence and energy of the Holy Ghost; and God has ordained that we shall be received into that society by the Sacrament of Baptism. Surely there is here no ignoring of the all-important work of the Blessed Trinity in providing for man's salvation.

But neither, on the other hand, is there any slighting of the indispensable condition of personal faith, personal spiritual life. When we graft a branch into the vine, or into any other plant or tree, do we say that this grafting dispenses with the necessity of life in the branch—that it is enough that this new member should adhere externally to the trunk without having the

living sap of the tree circulating through its own fibres? On the contrary, we say that we graft the branch into the parent stem that it may receive life from it. We say that it cannot have true and sufficient life unless it is so connected ; and further, we say that, unless it actually does receive such life, it will cease to be a part of that living organism, and will be broken off and cast away. Every point in this analogy holds in regard to the baptism of children or of adults into the Church of Christ.

And here we note the measure of truth which has given currency to the hypothetical view of the privileges of Baptism. There is a sense in which those blessings are unconditional, and there is a sense in which they may be said to be conditional. What privilege is by God's ordinance attached to the Sacrament is certainly unconditional. Where baptism is duly administered and rightly received, the baptized person is truly united to the Church which is the Body of Christ, the Temple of the Holy Ghost, the Family of God. These blessings are verily ours. We can give thanks for them. We can stand upon them.

But these gifts and blessings do not ensure the salvation or the sanctification of those who receive them. All the spiritual blessings of the life of grace are strictly conditional even to those who have been baptized, and may be forfeited or en-


joyed just as we lay hold of them, appropriate them, make them our own in a life of humble abnegation, of steadfast faith, and of earnest hope and love. We may sell our birthright, if we please, and cast away our inheritance. We may, like the great examples of unbelief, think "scorn of that pleasant land" which is provided for us; or we may go on and enjoy the milk and honey which are ever flowing within its boundaries. But at any rate these blessings have been provided for us and they are ours unless we reject or neglect them.

And here is the answer to those who ask us what benefit or profit there is then in baptism, since it does not secure our salvation and may even increase our guilt. What should we say to the man who asked us what profit there was in being an Englishman or an American? Should we allow that there was nothing in these names, because many of those who bore them were unworthy of them? And, in like manner, shall not we glory in our spiritual birthright and give thanks to Him who has called us out of darkness into His own marvellous light? And shall we not find, in the consciousness of this privilege, an incentive and a help to live no longer to ourselves, but to Him who died for us and has risen again?

God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. To all mankind is this gift

assured. Christ was incarnate and lived and died and rose again for the whole human race. "We thus judge that when One died for all, then all died," and so when One rose, all were raised up with Him. And yet these blessings have a peculiar meaning to those who have been by baptism brought into the redeemed and regenerated community, the Church of God. These gifts of grace are ours. We have no right to cast them away. We have not even to labour for them, we have only to enter into them and to possess them. And so shall we learn the lesson of dying to self and the world and living to God, of crucifying the old man that the new man may arise within us; so that we may be able to enter into that experience of the Apostle when he says: "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me" (Gal. ii. 20).

The Lord's Supper.



LECTURE II.

THE REVEREND G. McCLELLAN FISKE, D.D.,

Rector of S. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

† *In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

IN approaching this august subject, gentlemen, on which I have been invited to address you, let me, first of all, affirm my sincere intention to speak in filial submission to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

And may the Holy Spirit guide and keep from error both in faith and life each one of us, who draws near to contemplate the venerable Sacrament of the Altar.

For that Sacrament is the most conspicuous practical feature of the Church. It is the highest act of worship. It is admittedly the most solemn ministration pertaining to the individual religious life, and it is, as Dean Church * suggests,

* "Oxford Movement," p. 56.

"the foundation of ecclesiastical discipline and authority." Believing then that the Church has a reliable tradition concerning this great Sacrament, we will examine three distinguishing features of this tradition, viz:

I. The Sacrifice.

II. The Real Presence.

III. The Communion.

I. Worship is the instinct of a rational creature. It is the confession of his sense of the distance between himself and his Creator. He records his experience of the contrast in the outcry,* "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord 'Thou art my God,' my goods are nothing unto Thee." He must fall down and adore.

Worship being the motion of a loving heart and an admiring mind in the presence of the Heart of hearts and the Mind of minds expresses itself in sacrifice. Who does not understand the feeling which exclaims, "What can we give to one we love?" The best things which we have must attest our homage, and then we must give ourselves. The Magi not only opened their treasures and offered precious gifts, but they fell down and worshipped. They would give not only gold and myrrh and incense, but they would give themselves.

This is the primary account of sacrifice. It is

* Ps. xvi. 2.

the worship of dependent beings wholly carried away by the fulness of their love. It is the giving of one's self. It is the principle of that worship which angels in Heaven offer, and it would seem that earth has never been without it, for, as a spiritual writer * says: "Of this we may be certain, when the prince of this world and the powers of evil first turned aside to seek their own glory instead of using God's gifts to the glory of the giver, then first did the joy of holy sacrifice cease, and the world which had been an altar became a desolation."

In the earth recalled from chaos the loving relation to God of its new inhabitant and master, man, was one of sacrifice. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil stood for that sacrifice which man made in maintaining union with God, for it told of the sacrifice of man's bodily appetite, of his will, and of his reason. When sin came, bringing guilt and estrangement from God, sacrifice remained no longer the full and untarnished love of the innocent. It became the tearful worship of the penitent. Offerings, like the choicest fruits or the sweetest flowers, which should declare the joyous integrity of life, no longer would suffice. A penal element had entered into the essentials of a sacrifice. The spirit, torn in pain out of its material organism, must

* Benson : "Redemption."

return to the God who gave it. The real mystery of suffering and death is the mystery of Atonement. In whatever way man came to know the law that without shedding of blood there is no remission, he knew it, and the gravity of his offence, who would ignore it, is taught us by the doom of Cain. The long spiritual history of fallen man is traced by this scarlet thread of bloody sacrifices. The most prominent landmarks of the wanderings of the patriarchal days were the altars, in whose bleeding victims they called upon the name of the Lord.

When the Church of God began to have a settled habitation, its worship appears elaborated in a vast and complex system of manifold sacrifices expressive of the different sentiments and needs of the human soul. But the whole array was tinged with blood. Tributes of praise and triumph and pious exultation rose to Heaven bedewed with blood.

Two of the grandest occasions of rejoicing that we read of, Noah's thanksgiving after the flood and Solomon's dedication of the Temple, were celebrated in rivers of sacrificial blood.

And yet along with this unbroken line of bloody sacrifice went another continuous variety of sacrifice in the offerings of bread and wine, "among the heathen races, as uniform and familiar a feature of sacrifice as it was among the Jews

themselves." * This seemed to say that sacrifice is not essentially and originally an affair of blood. It pointed to the Eucharistic phases of sacrifice, and very early the mysterious figure of Melchisedec, as King of Peace and Priest of God Most High, bringing forth bread and wine, looked forward to a tranquil day when the "Priest upon His Throne" should do His office and be still a Priest, though in doing it He bleeds and dies again no more forever.

Now for almost nineteen hundred years last past, the bulk of Christendom, those great Catholic bodies which have maintained an unbroken succession in faith, ministry, and sacraments, have regarded their chief service of worship, the Holy Eucharist, as a sacrifice. They have not hesitated to call it so.† They have called their clergy, priests and the most honorable office of their priesthood has been held to be the consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ. The place of their ministering in that solemnity has been called everywhere the Altar. And their Liturgies have been full of sacrificial language. Midmost in this Altar-history stands the Cross. It marks an era in the course of sacrifice. With the Cross bloodshed abruptly ceases.

What does this signify? Clearly this: Atone-

* Medd: "The One Mediator," Lecture iv. Willis "Worship of the Old Covenant," viii., § 2; ix., § 2. † Appendix, Note I.

ment has been found. "It is finished," is the language of the Priest and Victim who has wrought it.

Does this cessation of pain, and blood, and death, also involve the cessation of sacrifice as a mode of worship? It would seem not. The sacrificial principle does not appear to be done away.

The sacrifice of Christ was a perfect sacrifice. He was wholly acceptable to the Father. He was the offering of a sweet-smelling savor. He made a perfect act of worship. He gave His body to be scourged and torn and pierced and smitten, and to die. He made a complete surrender of His will. He poured out His blood to ransom and to cleanse. He delivered His spirit into His Father's hands.* Adoration, propitiation, love, thanksgiving, peace, went forth from the Cross. It was a perfect worship by a perfect sacrifice of infinite merit. It need never be repeated because it is inexhaustible. It can never be repeated because it is beyond all price. He, the Gospel-Sacrifice, summed up and fulfilled all the multifold sacrifices of the law. He Himself was the true holocaust of Self-Dedication. He was the real Eucharistic offering of Peace. He was the true, the very, the one, only, all-sufficient offering of Expiation.†

* "The Highest Worship:" Sermons by the Paulists, 1864.

† Baring-Gould: "Our Inheritance," chap. xxxiv. Willis: "Worship of the Old Covenant," iv., § 2.

He was at once the plenitude and the reality of sacrifice. "It is finished." No more pain. No more blood. No more death. It could receive no additions. Its power was full and everlasting. He offered one sacrifice for sins forever. This is what we mean by the Sacrifice of Christ being finished. As an act of His will, productive in the travail of His soul and the anguish of His body of an eternal efficacy, it is finished. But the employment and application of that eternally efficacious act are still going on.

That is to say, Christ Himself is still using and applying His sacrifice, and in that sense is still sacrificing.* He suffers no more. He dies no more. But He presents and pleads His sacrifice.† "I beheld," says S. John the Divine, "and lo! in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders stood a Lamb as it had been slain." So we might have expected from our being told in the Epistle to the Hebrews that Christ is entered "into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."‡

This intercession of Christ in Heaven is not one of word merely. It is described to us as one of action. He shows Himself as marked by the Cross, as the One who was pierced, as the One who was dead, as the Lamb once slain. All this belongs to His sacrifice, to its perfection and

* Appendix, Note II.

† Rev. v. 6.

‡ Heb. ix. 24.

completeness. We must include in Christ's sacrifice His intercession in Heaven. This was taught us by the ancient prefigurative sacrifices. On the Day of Atonement* the sacrifice included not only the slaughter of the victim, but the solitary entrance of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies and the sprinkling of the blood before the Mercy-Seat. This latter function is fulfilled in what Christ does in Heaven now. His intercession is a stage of His sacrifice. It is its crowning act, and in it His sacrifice abides in eternal activity.

Such is the relation between the Cross and the present life of Christ in Heaven. Of each of these regarded in the order of time we use the name of sacrifice. That word is used in concentric circles of signification. Christ sacrificed on the Cross. Christ is sacrificing in Heaven. They are successive phases of one vast transaction.

That the present work of our Blessed Lord in Heaven is a work of sacrifice is expressly asserted by the fact of His eternal priesthood. He is a Priest forever. Being then a Priest now and always—"yesterday, to-day and forever"—He must of necessity have somewhat to offer. And, as we have said, He offers Himself as the Lamb once slain. He is Victim as well as Priest. "A

* Lev. xvi.

victim, once actually sacrificed by death and accepted, may, if endued with new and never-ending life, be continually offered—*i.e.*, presented, pleaded, brought into remembrance before God. And this continual offering and presentation of a sacrifice once made is itself a sacrificial act, and constitutes him who does it a priest according to S. Paul's definition, 'one ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins' (Heb. v. 1). The act of offering or presenting a victim is a sacrifice, though that victim be not, as of old, a new one slain on each occasion, nor yet the same slain anew on each occasion. It is a true sacrifice, though the victim be always the same, not slain anew, but offered as before slain once for all, and 'after the power of an endless life,' possessing an abiding virtue forevermore. It is a propitiatory sacrifice, as pleading before God for all the successive generations, for all the several individuals of the human race, the one only expiation once made.' " *

Now we reach this point: The name and reality of sacrifice sublimated from death and blood are transported into Heaven as their sphere. We see how Calvary and Heaven are connected, in what sense they are one, how Calvary lives on and is used in Heaven.

* "The Church and the World:" Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Here the question arises—What are the limits of the heavenly sphere, wherein this bloodless pleading of past suffering continually proceeds? Is earth included in that sphere? According to the supernatural order, the order of life in Christ, Heaven and Earth are one. "God . . . hath raised us up together and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."* "Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.'"†

If, then, Heaven and Earth are one, if we, while yet in the flesh, are standing within the sphere of the eternal High Priest's office, it is clear that we must have some expression of that sacrifice and priesthood here on earth. Christ, suffering death upon the Cross for our redemption, made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," but that does not mean the abro-

* Eph. ii. 4-6.

† Heb. xii., 22, 23, 24.

gation of sacrifice on earth any more than it means the abrogation of sacrifice in Heaven. Heaven and Earth are one, and as Christ sacrifices in Heaven so He does in Earth, and we call the earthly view of His Intercessory Sacrifice the Holy Eucharist.

Now there is a two-fold sense in which the word sacrifice is used, an absolute and a relative sense.* A sacrifice is absolute when it is a sacrifice *per se*, in itself, alone by itself, without reference to what has been before. A sacrifice is relative or commemorative when it is related to another act, whose representation or commemoration it contains. It is nowhere claimed that the name sacrifice is used absolutely as applied to the Eucharist. It is used relatively, as having to do with the sacrifice of the Cross. The sacrifice of the Cross provides man with a sacrifice in Whom, and by Whom, and with Whom he can approach God, and be accepted, and hold communion with Him. In the sacrifice of the Altar we see man in Christ approaching God in the power and memory of the Cross.

When our Lord took bread and blessed and brake it, and said, "This is My Body," when He took the Cup and gave thanks and said, "This is My Blood," and gave to His Apostles, He was doing sacrifice. He was discharging His Priest-

* Perrone: Tract. de Aug. Euch. Sac.: "De Sacrificio," 199.

hood.* "This is My Body, which is being given for you; "This is My Blood which is being shed for you and for many for the remission of sins," was literally and exactly what He said. He was offering Himself then. The Cross, which so soon followed, only proved how real was the offering He had made a few hours before. And commanding His Apostles ("Do this in remembrance of me") to minister what He identified with Himself when He said, "This is My Body"—"This is My Blood," He made them priests. He gathered them into His own priesthood, and constituted them and their successors, organs, through whom bringing forth bread and wine, He might show Himself a Priest after the order of Melchisedec. So that the life of the Christian priesthood in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is the earthly manifestation of that same life of sacrifice which Christ, as the Eternal Priest, openly lives in Heaven.

The circumstances under which our Lord ordained the Blessed Eucharist were sacrificial ones. The occasion, the Passover, was a sacrifice.† Sacrifice was the *habitat* of the Jewish mind. Those to whom He spoke were imbued with sacrificial ideas and full of sacrificial associations. And His speech was the language of

* Medd: "One Mediator," Lect. vi., 143.

† Willis: "Worship of the Old Covenant," chap. xi., 2.

sacrifice. "When He said, 'This do as a memorial of me,' His words undoubtedly would convey to a Greek ear the idea of offering." * The word "do," and the word "remembrance" are words which had a technical and definite signification. They were words used repeatedly in the Septuagint version of the Scriptures of sacrificing and of sacrifice.† "So that when the Lord bade them 'Do this for His Anamnesis (or Memorial)' He used a word which indicated a very solemn, sacrificial memorial, and not a private act of reminding themselves or one another." No words could re-echo more faithfully the purpose of the Holy Eucharist as thus announced by its Divine Author than the statement of our Church in the Catechism in answer to the question "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" "For a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." That "Continual Remembrance" means an objective action and not a mere subjective operation of the mind, precisely as our Lord said, and as He was understood by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word. The usage, the behavior, the ritual, the Liturgies of the Church,

* Baring-Gould: "Our Inheritance," p. 366, with note.

† Lev. ix. 7. Ex. x. 25. Ps. lxvi. 15. Ezek. xlv. 13-15. Lev. xxiv. 7. Num. x. 10.

from the day in which He was taken up thenceforward, show that He made His Eucharist a sacrifice.

I need not detain you by a lengthened chain of citations designed to show that the Holy Eucharist has borne from the outset of its history the sacrificial name and character. Long before Christ came His holy prophets spake often of Gospel days and Gospel worship. These predictions portray that future worship as a sacrificial worship. The Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi thus preach the Gospel.* And as soon as we reach the Christian dispensation we see the fulfilment of those prophecies.

Not to mention, as we might, what individual fathers† and doctors wrote of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, we have only to listen to what the Church said daily at her Altars throughout the world. In the Alexandrian sanctuaries they prayed that "with a pure heart and pure conscience we may offer to Thee this sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savor for the remission of sins and the sins of Thy people." They also said: "We offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, which all nations offer to Thee, O Lord, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, from the north and the south;

* Sadler: "Church Doctrine," Bible Truth, chap. iv., note 2.

† Appendix, Note III.

for Thy name is great among the Gentiles and in every place incense is offered to Thy Name and a pure offering." * This Liturgy of S. Mark therefore agrees with what S. Justin Martyr † witnesses, viz.: that the Body and Blood of Christ offered in the Holy Eucharist was the pure offering foretold by Malachi. In the Liturgy of S. James it is said: "This Thy sacred and spiritual table whereon Thine Only-Begotten Son, and our Lord Jesus Christ is mystically set forth as a sacrifice for me a sinner." "Cause us to stand pure before Thy holy Altar that we may offer to Thee the sacrifice of praise." We hear too of this "tremendous and unbloody sacrifice," and "Thy holy and spotless sacrifice." ‡

The Liturgy of S. Clement prays: "Send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ." The Liturgy of S. Chrysostom directs the priest to pray secretly: "Through Thy ineffable and measureless love, Thou didst unchangeably and immutably become man and didst take the title of our High Priest, and didst give to us the hierurgy of this liturgic and unbloody sacrifice." §

"Strengthen with the might of the Holy Ghost

* Neale and Littledale.

† Dial. Tryph., § 117.

‡ Neale and Littledale.

§ Neale and Littledale.

me that have been endued with the grace of the priesthood that I may stand by this Thy Holy Altar and sacrifice Thy Holy and spotless Body and precious Blood." *

Again, after rehearsing the words of institution, the priest says: "We offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice."—"The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints, Basil the Great" speaks of "this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice." †

Now these are some of the oldest offices for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the world. They are utterances of the Church which have been least affected and altered by time. They might be multiplied an hundred-fold, but they suffice to show how the Church has regarded what is done at the Altar.

Our Prayer-Book speaks the same language. Our Liturgy speaks for itself. Its witness is an ancient one and it accords with other ancient witnesses such as we have quoted. Our Prayer, or Canon, of Consecration says that Jesus Christ "did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death and sacrifice until His coming again." After the specific act of consecration has been performed, when by the power of the Holy Ghost, on the recital of the words of insti-

* Neale and Littledale.

† *Ibid.*

tution, the elements already offered once as mere bread and wine at the Offertory have become the Body and Blood of Christ, there is a second oblation of what is now not only bread and wine but Christ's Most Blessed Body and Blood. It is difficult to see how anything could be more distinctly sacrificial than this is, or how the nature of that memorial, which Christ instituted, could be more unmistakably explained. "We celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now *offer* unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make." That is to say: the memorial which Christ instituted and commanded is the offering of His Body and Blood under the forms of bread and wine.

No Liturgy in the whole history of the Catholic Church declares more plainly that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, and what the office of that sacrifice is, than our own Liturgy does when it says: "And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls

and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto Thee." At the close we confess that "although we are *unworthy* to offer *any* sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this (*i.e.*, this sacrifice—which is) our bounden duty and service."

When we consider this venerable and hallowed language of the Church, we must remember that it has an ancestry, and a traditional signification. These terms, "memory," "remembrance," "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" must not be interpreted as naming things merely verbal or mental. Such an ordinary, modern sense applied to these terms as they are employed in the Liturgy does violence both to good scholarship and to Divine truth. "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is a technical phrase and means not only that in which the heart and lips are concerned. It means an external object offered to God, which makes the thoughts of our hearts and the words of our lips acceptable; and that external object offered to God, which makes the thoughts of our hearts and the words of our lips acceptable, is the Body and Blood of Christ. The term "sacrifice of praise" goes far, very far, back. It is the translation of the Hebrew name of the peace-offering,* and fulfilled in Christ Himself it came into the services of the Christian Church to name our Lord as a sacramental offering. In

* Lev. vii. 5.

this sense it is constantly found in the Liturgies of all parts of the Catholic Church, and among them in our own.

We must not fail to notice how perfectly our liturgical statement of the Eucharistic Sacrifice gathers up and commemorates and represents the different leading features of our Lord's One Offering, and what a witness the Holy Eucharist therefore is to the fulness and power of the Lamb of God. We have seen how the prefigurative sacrifices of the law have been conveniently summed up under three heads of self-dedication, thanksgiving, and expiation, and how our Lord as the One Sacrifice united and fulfilled all these in Himself.

Now, as He pleads the merits of His death and passion openly in Heaven—and at earthly Altars sacramentally, those three great lines of relation between man and God are indicated to us. The Eucharistic Sacrifice by its very title, "Eucharist," teaches us that it is an instrument of Thanksgiving. It is "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." The Eucharistic Sacrifice teaches us of, and is an instrument of, Self-Dedication. In union with Christ's most precious Body and Blood we offer to God, confident of His acceptance, our alms, our prayers, the fulness of the earth, ourselves, our souls and bodies, our self-denials and our fastings.

And the Eucharistic Sacrifice teaches us of, and is an instrument by which we may avail ourselves of, and apply to ourselves and all Christ's members, on Earth or in Paradise, the Expiation He has purchased for us on the Cross. We offer the sacrifice humbly beseeching God to grant that by the merits and death of His Son Jesus Christ, we and all His whole Church "may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion."

What a range is covered by this moving appeal to God! What a multitude of objects is it framed to meet! When we consider these manifold aspects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we can at once see why, as in the Prayer-Book, the Church requires or encourages the celebration of the Holy Communion on so many different occasions. It is a sacrifice for Christians living in the flesh. It is a sacrifice for Christians who are delivered from the burden of the flesh.* Not only ourselves, but all God's whole Church, living and departed, may be blessed and helped, their peace made more abundant, and their consummation and bliss in body and soul hastened by the mighty pleading of the One Pure Offering.

While the Church of England has thus strongly asserted the old, immemorial Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as Christ's own

* Appendix, Note IV.

pleading, under earthly forms, of Himself once offered on the Cross, she has in the 31st Article of Religion put on record her repudiation of vulgar errors once current, but now happily known no longer. The "sacrifices of masses" * must not be confounded with the Sacrifice of the Mass, or, as we are more used to hearing it called, the Eucharistic Sacrifice.† There was at one time an idea, due to popular ignorance and superstition, that the sacrifice of the Altar was altogether distinct from the sacrifice of the Cross, that each celebration renewed and repeated the sufferings of the Cross, and that Christ was in a certain almost literal way crucified afresh. There are now probably few or no traces of such a notion to be found in any quarter of Christendom, but the Article stands as a witness to the "supremacy, the unique character, and all-embracing reach of the sacrifice of the Cross."

Thus we see that the Holy Eucharist is the earthly, veiled presentation of the great act of Christ in Heaven. It is, as we must ever keep in view, the act of Christ Himself. He is the true, the real, though unseen Priest at every Altar of His Church. Therefore His members are involved in His action. They are a kingdom of

* Appendix, Note V.

† See Father Hall's excellent tract, "The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Sacrifices of Masses." Jas. Pott & Co., New York.

priests, since they are members of Him who is the enthroned Priest, the High Priest of our profession. What He does in the celebration of the Eucharist, they, in union with Him, do also in their inferior degree, or rather He does it in them. The members join with their head, in urging His transcendent merits. This makes the sacrifice to be something in which every baptized person has an interest and a share. This truth, that the Holy Eucharist is, in this way, a sacrifice linked with what Christ does in Heaven above, and that in it we enter into the very exercise of our Lord's offices, as Mediator and Advocate with the Father, and realize that He is the Propitiation for our sins—this great truth is a large part of the reason why we should have constant, daily celebrations, and why any baptized person, even if not prepared to partake of the sacrifice, may yet be present, rightfully, properly, and profitably to unite, as a member of the Eternal Priest, in the worship which in Him is offered to the Almighty and Everlasting God.

II. We will now consider what is offered, as Christ, thus exercising His Eternal Priesthood, brings Earth and Paradise and Heaven into One. This great Sacrifice, the divinely constituted worship of the Church of God, comes to us enshrined in a Sacrament.

But what is a Sacrament? As the Church de-

fines it for us in the Catechism it is "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

It is plainly asserted here that a Sacrament has two parts—an outward part and an inward part—*i.e.*, in a Sacrament there is some outward thing which we see, and there is, at the same time, joined with that outward part or form, some inward part or thing, which we cannot see, but which is nevertheless certainly and really *there*. It is the nature of a Sacrament to have these two parts.

It is important to remember this definition, because departures from it have caused erroneous and mistaken views concerning the Blessed Sacrament.

Thus defining a Sacrament, the Church goes on to inquire in the Catechism, "What is the outward part or sign in the Lord's Supper?" The answer is: "Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." "What is the inward part or thing signified?" The answer is: "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," or as the original wording in the English Prayer-Book reads: "which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faith-

ful in the Lord's Supper." The terms employed in this portion of the Catechism are equivalents of the Latin words of scientific theology—terms which from long use had come to have a very precise, accurate, and accepted meaning.

The theology of the Blessed Sacrament since S. Augustine's day had been accustomed to distinguish three things concerning it*—The outward part, called in Latin the *sacramentum*, or sign—the *res sacramenti*, the reality of the Sacrament, the inward part, the thing signified, the thing under the sign—and the *virtus*, or benefit of the Sacrament. This nomenclature and division, under English equivalents, are used in the Catechism, which speaks of the *outward part*, or *sacramentum*; the *inward part*, or *res sacramenti*; the *virtus*, or *benefits*, which we receive thereby. Moreover, the expression, "verily and indeed," is in Latin *vere et ipsa*, truly and really. What is then asserted by the Church is, that under the outward part in the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ are spiritually—*i.e.*, after the law and manner of spirit—but never-

* It will be noticed that the Church Catechism speaks of *three* parts in the Lord's Supper: (1) the sign; (2) the thing signified; and (3) the benefits; whereas in Baptism there are but *two*: (1) the sign; and (2) the inward grace. In this distinction our Catechism follows the teaching of earlier theologians from S. Augustine downward.

theless "*truly* and *really*," taken and received. This is what is known as the Real Presence.

It is this truth which is the life and magnificence, and power, and awfulness, and comfort of the Altar. It is because Christ is there that we can pray to and praise and worship God with confidence and joy. It is because Christ is there that we press forward eagerly to receive into our dying bodies and sin-famished souls Him, who is the Bread of Life. The secret charm, the attraction, which resides in the Holy Eucharist is the Presence of Christ. By His Eucharistic Presence He brings home to us the fulfilment of His own prediction, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto Me,"* for as we discern Him lifted up in Eucharistic Oblation, we realize, as in no other way we can so well, His lifting up upon the Cross, and in His Ascension. It is a very striking fact that as soon as the Blessed Sacrament came to be celebrated in the Church of God, the truth of Christ's office as Priest and Sacrifice came out strongly to her view.

It would seem that the Holy Eucharist was the method by which the Holy Spirit brought distinctly into the consciousness of the Church a realization of the true nature of the Sacrifice of the Cross. And so the Blessed Sacrament has

* S. John xii. 32.

ever been the witness, and defender, and proclaimer of the Atonement. Feeble views of the Atonement are a consequence of feeble views of the Holy Eucharist.

There are few matters of doctrine which, it would seem, ought to be freer from dispute among the faithful than this one. Christ's words were few and simple. He spoke unqualifiedly, saying: "This is My Body"—"This is My Blood."

Century after century the Church taught, and lived, and fought "the good fight of faith," "strengthened with the Bread of Life," taking Her Lord's words in a literal sense.

Consider within what comparatively recent times, and in what—relatively speaking—an insignificant fraction of the Church, that literal sense has been denied or questioned. For * well-nigh a thousand years the Church throughout the world had one belief as to the Holy Eucharist. She discerned the Lord's Body and Blood under the forms of bread and wine, and serenely worshipped Christ upon His Altar-Throne. And after the subject became a controverted one, it was several hundred years longer before it was asked out-and-out as to the Eucharist, "Is the Lord among us or not?" And when the Real Presence was actually denied, from what quarter did that denial proceed? From individuals, or from

* Appendix, Note VI.

irresponsible groups of people on the Continent of Europe, who had withdrawn from the Church and placed themselves in hostile and schismatical array against her. So that if one deny the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion he ought clearly to understand the company he is therein keeping.

That the consecrated elements in the Eucharist are only bread and wine, or that they are the Body and Blood of Christ to the faith of the receiver only, or that they are only in virtue and efficacy the Body and Blood of Christ, are ideas and theories alien to the doctrine of the Catholic Church in general and alien to that particular part of the Catholic Church to which we belong. Though held by individuals, the Church does not hold them. Neither her history nor formularies give them countenance.* The Anglican Communion has steadfastly maintained, in harmony with Catholic consent, that in the act of consecration, performed by a priest of apostolic succession, the bread and wine, while not ceasing to be bread and wine, become, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of Christ. This is what the Church has always held from the beginning. She has not attempted to explain "how" it is. Our Lord when asked "how," only repeated what He had said before. In harmony

* Appendix, Note VII.

with Holy Scripture the Church has called the consecrated elements bread and wine. She has also called them the Body and Blood of Christ. By consecration they are two things at once: according to the natural order bread and wine; according to the supernatural order the Body and Blood of Christ. Therefore both Holy Scripture and the Church call them alternately by either name. When the priest delivers the blessed Sacrament he says, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ"—"The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." In the Post Communion we give thanks that we have been fed "with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

There are two features connected with the Holy Eucharist, which of themselves, apart from other considerations, seem quite sufficient to assert the Real Presence.* One is consecration. The consecration of the bread and wine we find, from the first, the characteristic of the blessed Sacrament. It has been regarded as an act of the profoundest importance. It has been most rigidly guarded. It has been performed according to a strict rule and formula, so that we speak of the canon, that is, the rule, of consecration. And none but a priest may do this act.

The other significant feature is the universal

* Appendix, Note VIII.

attribution of the mysterious change at consecration to the Holy Ghost. Usually this is positively expressed, as in ancient Liturgies and in our own, in what is known as the Invocation—a prayer that the Holy Ghost would make the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ. The exact position of the Invocation has varied—sometimes before and sometimes (as in our Liturgy) after the words of institution, and sometimes (as in the English Liturgy) not expressed at all, but the belief of the Church has always been the same, that the consecration is effected by the Holy Ghost. This fact borne in mind is a corrective of that modern subjective idea that faith makes Christ present. Faith does not make Christ present. The Holy Ghost makes Christ present.

The Eucharistic concord of the Church was disturbed, when attempt was made to answer that question, "How," which our Lord at the outset declined to answer.

Transubstantiation sprang from a laudable intention to guard the truth of Christ's real Sacramental presence, but however well men meant in the beginning the results have been disastrous. Transubstantiation and the Real Presence are by no means synonymous. They are not at all one and the same thing. The Real Presence is the great Eucharistic fact of the Church's history. Transubstantiation is an account of one way in

which a part of the Church has dealt with that fact.

Transubstantiation * is a definition of the mode of the Real Presence. It is admitted in Roman theology to be a doctrine distinct from the doctrine of the Real Presence.† Reviewing the history of this term we can scarcely regard it otherwise than as an unhappy one. Employed in two senses, a popular and a scholastic one,‡ in the former of these senses it has been condemned by the Anglican Church in Article XXVIII., wherein it is said, "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the bread and wine in the supper of the Lord) cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

In the popular acceptance of the word as here used, "substance" means that general aggregate of qualities presented to our senses, and which

* Appendix, Note IX.

† Perrone: Tract. de August. Euch. Sacr., cap. ii. "De *Modo* quo Christus fit Præsens in Eucharistia *seu* Transubstantiatione." "Articulus de Transubstantiatione dogma esse *distinctum* a dogmate de reali Christi præsentia."

‡ For a brief but most satisfactory statement on this subject, see Dr. J. M. Neale's Appendix II., "On Transubstantiation," to his translation of "The Sacrament of the Altar." Note X. in appendix to this lecture.

we understand when we speak, for example, of a "hard substance." It is what we see, handle, taste, smell, measure, and weigh. A change of "substance," in this sense, overthrew indeed the nature of a Sacrament. It destroyed the outward and visible part. It contradicted the senses, because what men certainly saw, they were assured they did not really see. They thought they saw bread and wine, but they were told that no bread and wine were there. This vulgar conception gave occasion to many superstitions. The Sacrament became a physical thing. The thing signified was commensurate, so people were led to suppose, with the sign. The glorified, spiritualized humanity of Christ they took to be comprised within the quantitative limits of the material elements. For so much bread and so much wine were thought to be substituted so much body and so much blood. Some years after this popular superstition was denounced in the 28th Article under the name of Transubstantiation, the Roman Church also rebuked the same popular superstition in the Eucharistic utterances of the Council of Trent. She then reformed her Eucharistic teachings, but did it in philosophical language, and still kept for her statement of the mode of the real presence the old name, so associated with error, of Transubstantiation. It is but fair to say that Transubstantiation in the *popular*

sense, in which it came to be understood in mediæval days is not used in the present formal Eucharistic statements of the Roman Church. In these statements the word "substance" is used in the metaphysical or scholastic sense. In that sense "substance" is not the sum of all qualities perceptible by us, but it means something unseen and unknown by us, something wholly immaterial it may be. "Substance" is that which stands under what our senses note, it is that which makes the thing to be what it is, that which gives it its identity, and is considered as altogether distinct and apart from the qualities which we perceive. With "substance" so understood, "Transubstantiation," or the conversion of substance, is, of course, a very different idea from that "change of substance" mentioned in the 28th Article. But, in its best estate and in its most elevated construction, Transubstantiation is but a theory of the manner of the Real Presence clothed in the terms and ideas of the ancient philosophy of Aristotle and of the Realism of the Middle Ages. But the Catholic Church has never authoritatively explained the mode of Christ's Presence, much less tied herself to philosophical formulas on the Holy Eucharist. Transubstantiation in the metaphysical sense may be a pious, private opinion. It can be nothing more. It is a term *ambiguous*, in thus having two meanings

attached to it. It is a term *discredited* in having been, in one of these meanings, condemned, and it is a term *unauthorized* in never having received, even in its philosophical signification, Catholic consent.* We must look upon it as an unfortunate term, which forcibly emphasizes the sad consequences of attempting to define what Catholic antiquity was content to believe without speculation. Could it have been confined to its strict scholastic meaning, perhaps no harm might have ensued. But the degeneration of the learned meaning into the popular one bred superstition, division, and misunderstanding.

But Transubstantiation is not the only Eucharistic error which the Church would have us shun. Far worse than trying to tell *how* Christ is present in His Sacrament is the denying it altogether.

It was a modern invention of Zwingle, the explanation novel and unknown to antiquity, that "This is My Body" means "This represents My Body." This, just as truly as Transubstantiation, overthrows the nature of a Sacrament, and with a far more shocking overthrow, because it denies the Inward Part. And who can doubt that the irreverence, sacrilege, desecration, disparagement and neglect of the Holy Mysteries which have resulted from this mischievous imagination are infinitely more displeasing to God and have wrought

* Appendix, Note XI.

deeper and more widespread hurt to His Church and to His Truth than all the pious superstitions to which Transubstantiation has ever given birth. The Church evidently considers the denial of the Real Presence a graver error than Transubstantiation, for in the 28th Article she speaks first of such denial and spends a good many more words on that than she does on Transubstantiation. She says, "The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another," that is to say, it is not merely a symbol, a figurative ceremony conveying no inward grace, "but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death." In other words, it has an inward part as well as an outward part. She then goes on to say what this inward part is—"insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread, which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." So far the Article proceeds in rebuke of those who would evacuate the Sacrament of its mystery, by denying the inward part, and who would see in it only a bare and empty sign, with no substantial reality beneath the outward sign. The framer of this Article, Bishop Geste, of Rochester, was one whose doctrinal position was most distasteful to the Puritans of his day, who called him a Semi-



papist. He has fortunately left us his own account of what the Article was intended to teach, when he writes as follows* concerning the clause: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." He says: "I suppose you have heard how the Bishop of Gloucester found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb *only* in this Article—'The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper after a heavenly and spiritual manner *only*'—because it did take away the presence of Christ's Body in y^e Sacrament. Whereas between him and me I told him plainly, that this word *only* in the foresaid Article did not exclude y^e Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only y^e *grossness* and *sensibleness* in y^e receaving thereof. For I said unto him, though he tooke Christ's Body in his hand, received it with his mouthe, and that corporally, naturally, reallye, substantially and carnally, as y^e doctors doo write, yet he did not for all that, see it, feale it, smell it, nor taste it—We may say y^t in y^e Sacrament His very Body is present, yea really, that is to say, in deede, substantially, that is, in substance and corporally, carnally, and naturally—by which words is ment that His Very Bodye, His Verye Fleshe, and His verye Humaine Nature, is there, not after corporall, car-

* Pusey on "The Real Presence," p. 203, note

nall, or naturall wise, but invisibly, unspeakably, supernaturally, spiritually, divinely, and by waye unto Him only known." This is a convincing statement, by the very writer of the 28th Article himself, of what is intended to be implied by the term "spiritual," viz.: not to deny the reality of Christ's Presence, but to lift it above the range of any natural law known to us. That is to say, there is nothing in the inward part of this Sacrament which comes under the apprehension or cognizance of the senses. No perception, belonging to our bodily nature, will reveal anything to us at the Altar. There is nothing in sight, or sound, or taste, or smell, or touch, to indicate to us that anything is there save bread and wine. We believe. Our only evidence is faith, that evidence of things not seen. Faith in the word of Christ. Faith in the reality and power of the Holy Ghost. In that faith we approach, to adore, and to receive, under the outward forms of bread and wine, after a heavenly and spiritual manner, not to be understood or perceived by any earthly faculties, the spiritualized and glorified substance of Christ, Who is our life.

Faith is, as the Article says, the means (*i.e.*, the medium) whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten. Faith, as the Bishop of Derry* said not long ago, does not create the Presence.

* Sermon at S. Mary's, Cardiff, 1889.

It perceives it. Accordingly Christ's Presence is by no means dependent on the faith of the receiver. What we think about it, or believe or disbelieve about it, cannot make it in itself more or less than it is.* Our faith does not make Christ present, nor does our want of faith make Him absent. The Prayer of Humble Access declares this when we pray "*so* to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed through His most precious Blood," implying that it is possible for us *so* to eat and drink His Body and most precious Blood that these cleansing effects may *not* be wrought in us. We *can*—and here lies the burden of our responsibility—we *can* add to or diminish the *good* it may do us individually, by the faith, and penitence, and humility which we manifest in our use of it. It is a mystery. It is to be feared that those to whom the Real Presence, in spite of Holy Scripture, the Prayer Book, and the testimony of ages is still a hard saying, are somehow not conscious of the demands which the Incarnation makes on faith. It seems strange that faith, which professes to accept wholly and implicitly the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, should find any difficulty in accepting the Real Presence. Have such persons really

* Appendix, Note XII.

considered the stupendous marvels involved in God's being made man, and in the rising from the dead of Jesus of Nazareth? Have they seriously reflected that the Babe of Bethlehem on Mary's breast was all the time Almighty God, Who made all things and at that instant was upholding all things by the word of His power? Are they convinced that Jesus, Who was crucified, dead, and buried, raised Himself from death, and came and went through walls of rock and stone and fast-closed doors, and yet ate and drank, was seen and handled, and with flesh, bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, ascended into Heaven? Do they believe *these* mysteries, and yet hesitate to believe a mystery, no harder to believe than the three which I have mentioned? Have they noticed the Sacramental principle on which, in God's sublimest works of nature and of grace alike, are formed vast constellations of correlated truths, of which the Real Presence is only one? A human being—a *living* human being—is just exactly like a Sacrament. That is to say, a human being has an outward part and an inward part. You have a body and a soul. These are two distinct substances, yet they coexist in a mysterious and inexplicable unity. You know that they are not confused or blended in such a way as to form any third substance. They are

two substances, coexisting in unity. You know that they are distinct substances, because you have seen the outward part deprived of its inward part—the body without the soul. We speak of a human being by either part of his nature, as it pleases us. We speak of him as a *body*. We say, *somebody*, *anybody*. But when we use that mode of expression, we do not of course mean to assert that that body has nothing to it *but* body; we do not mean to deny the existence of the soul. On the other hand, we may speak of human beings as “souls.” There are so many “souls” here in Church now. But in so speaking we are not asserting that people are all souls or that they have no bodies.

Even so it is with the Blessed Sacrament. Holy Scripture and the Church call the sacred species, bread and wine. They also call them the Body and Blood of Christ. They are mentioned indifferently by the outward part, or by the inward part, just as human beings are mentioned indifferently, according to either the outward part or the inward part; although, of course, it is more natural that, in both cases, we should more frequently perhaps use the higher and nobler part by which to designate the whole. When God made man, He formed his body, we are told, out of the dust of the ground. That was the outward part, perfect and complete.

Then, God breathed into his nostrils. He breathed upon that outward part and man *became* a living soul. He did not cease to be what he was before, but he became something that he was not before. He became something more than he had been before. When it says that he *became* a living soul, it does not mean that the body formed out of the dust of the ground was *transubstantiated* into *soul*, so that there was no bodily substance left. It does not mean that the substance of the body was so changed that the body was there no longer. That would have overthrown man's nature as a human being. So, when the Church tells us that in consecration, by the power of the Holy Ghost bread and wine *become* the Body and Blood of Christ, she does not mean to assert that there are no bread and wine there any more. That would overthrow the nature of the Eucharist as a Sacrament. But when it is said that man became a living soul, it *is* asserted that a substance—a spiritual substance—soul—was united to the material substance. A change then took place, to be sure. That form was changed into a living soul; not, however, by change of one substance into another, but by union of both substances—soul and body. And so the Church, in the Blessed Sacrament, when she says that bread and wine *become* the Body and Blood of Christ, asserts a *change*, not of one substance into an-

other, but of the union of two—a material and a spiritual substance. This light is thrown upon us from nature, from the Sacramental constitution of our being. A still stronger and more solemn light is shed upon us from the mysteries of grace.

Take the Incarnation. What do we understand by the Incarnation? Suppose you were asked to state what the great truth of the Incarnation is. You would, of course, reply, that it is the union of the two natures, human and divine, in the one person of Jesus Christ. Let us examine that statement in the explicit form given to us in the Athanasian Creed in the English Prayer-Book. There, we are told, that it is necessary to everlasting salvation that one believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and “the right faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and man, of the substance of His mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father as touching His Godhead: inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Who although He be God and man: yet is He not two, but one Christ; one; not by *conversion* of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the manhood into God; one al-

together; not by confusion of substance: but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and man is one Christ."

Here again, in this great mystery of the Incarnation, we are taught, and we hold two distinct substances, coexisting in union, neither lost in the other, nor both confused together. In very ancient times, you will remember that this doctrine of the Incarnation was attacked and assailed, and these attacks and assaults called out these careful statements of the creed of S. Athanasius. Men thought they found a difficulty in believing that the two substances, Godhead and manhood, could coexist in one person. They contended that the humanity of Christ was not a reality, much as the Roman popular theory of Transubstantiation denied the outward part of the Sacrament. Or, they said that Christ was merely man, much as the ordinary sectarian now denies the reality of the Inward Part of the Sacrament. Or yet again, they said that the two natures were so mixed up that a third something was the result, something which was not exactly human, nor yet divine.

In opposition to these ideas the Church defended the truth of the Incarnation by maintaining, as she does in the Athanasian Creed, that in Christ the two substances, divine and human, did exist in their reality and integrity; that Christ

was at once perfect God and perfect man, that both manhood and Godhead were as really present in Him, as soul and body are present in a human being. And in those days, gentlemen, when neither Romanism nor Zwinglianism had as yet arisen to disturb men's belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, in those days the Fathers and doctors of the Church—the defenders and champions of the faith*—used the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as an analogy to illustrate the truth of the Incarnation. They said that, as there are two substances co-existing in the Lord's Supper—the bread and wine, and the Body and Blood of Christ—as these two are ineffably united, not by any absorption of one into another, not by any confusion of both, so, in the person of Christ, co-exist His divinity and His humanity. In our day the case is reversed. The doctrine of the Incarnation as stated in the Creed is now generally accepted; but we have fallen into disputes, in these latter days, as to the truth of the Blessed Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. Now, in the providence of God, we may revert to the truth of the Incarnation to illustrate the belief of the Church concerning the Holy Eucharist, and we may see by the fact of the Incarnation, no less than by the fact of our organization as soul and

* Appendix, Note XIII.

body, that, in the dispensations of God, a thing may be two things at the same time; that a higher substance may be so conveyed under the veil of a lower one that both shall be distinct and real, and yet so joined that no human eye or mind can penetrate the mystery of their union. From Holy Scripture recall this statement of the Incarnation, viz.: "The Word was made flesh." That does not mean that the substance of the Word was changed into flesh. It does not mean that the divine nature was so changed into human nature that there was no divine nature left. No. It means, as you all understand, that the divine nature was united to human nature, that it made manhood a tabernacle beneath which it dwells. In a similar way the Church has always believed as to the Real Presence. She has believed that the bread and wine are made the Body and Blood of Christ, much as the Word was made flesh, viz.: by the union of the sign with the thing signified, by the union of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ. And so the language of Holy Scripture, of our Blessed Lord, and of the Church's offices, falls into place, without being strained, and not having to be explained away. When our Blessed Lord was on the earth He was the Son of Man. He was also, at the same time, the Son of God. He was both at once. Even so when our Lord said, "This is My

Body," "This is My Blood," the faith of the Church has always understood Him literally, and has simply believed that He meant what He said, and that He was not using a figurative expression. It is bread and wine. It is His Body and Blood. It is both at once. The Church, in her offices, calls the consecrated elements bread and wine, but with more emphasis and frequency she also calls them the Body and Blood of Christ. They are both at once.*

"The primitive doctrine of the Catholic Church and of the ancient Liturgies is the only doctrine which satisfies both reason and faith. Christ is in His own Sacrament, according to His promise, by the power of the Holy Ghost, provided there be bread and wine, the words of institution, and a priest duly commissioned by Him. Here Christ offers Himself therein to all believers, and by contact with Himself makes them partakers of His glorified humanity and of His divine nature also. The way of His Presence is supernatural, above and beyond, but not contrary to nature. It is not a Presence after the manner of any body of which our senses can take cognizance, but after the manner of a 'spiritual body'—a body which has no 'when' and no 'where,' but which lives and moves and has its being after the manner of a spirit. God is a spirit," and the

* Appendix, Note XIV.

Son of Man has glorified our human nature "with the same glory which, as God, He had alongside of God before the world was." *

The truth of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist makes the history of Revelation continuous and consistent. That history is more than the history of man's consciousness of the Divine omnipresence. It is the history of a Special Presence in which God expressed His love to and favor for the people of His choice and covenant.† In Eden and after it, through patriarchal times, under the law, in tabernacle and temple, in theophanies and Shekinah, and finally in the Incarnation actually accomplished, we find this Special Presence as the distinctive nature of God's intercourse with His chosen people. In the Eucharistic Presence of Christ this tradition of Divine love is maintained. And so in the Eucharist abides this special Divine Presence, which is the glory of the Christian Church. Christ is in His Sacrament, Body, Soul and Divinity, for He is one and indivisible. And being wholly present the Church does and must worship Him, as she always has. Human acts of worship to His ineffable presence terminate in a Divine person. We worship not bread and wine, nor what we see.

* Church Times, Dec. 18th, 1891.

† *Vide* "Treatise on the Use and Import of the Eucharistic Symbols," by Alexander Knox, Esq.

We worship Christ. The Eucharistic belief of the Anglican Church is well set forth by an author whose work has the highest sanction, being officially recommended as a part of the course of theological study* by the Bishops of the American Church. He says: † "This Catholic and Apostolic Church has always avoided any attempt to determine too minutely the mode of the true presence in the Holy Eucharist. Guided by Scripture she establishes only those truths which Scripture reveals, and leaves the subject in that mystery in which God for His wise purposes has invested it. Taking as her immovable foundation the words of Jesus Christ, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood of the New Covenant,' and 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life,' she believes that the Body or Flesh, and the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one person, are verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, under the outward sign or form of bread and wine, which is on this account the partaking or communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. She believes that the Eucharist is not the sign of an *absent* body, and that those who partake

* General Convention Journal of 1889. Appendix xv.

† Palmer on "The Church," part ii., chap. vii.

of it, receive not merely the figure or shadow, or sign of Christ's Body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist not only the Flesh and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself both God and man."

III. We must now speak particularly of what may be regarded as an essential feature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, viz.: the Communion, the eating of the sacrifice.

There are two kinds of Communion acts in connection with the Holy Eucharist. One of these is a mental act, and is commonly called Spiritual Communion. The other is a physico-mental act, and is known in distinction from the other as Sacramental Communion. Both of these are recognized by the Anglican Church and by her great Doctors.* In the Rubric appended to the Office for the Communion of the Sick in the Prayer Book, these two different modes of Communion are alluded to. We are there told how that under certain circumstances by the exercise of the proper interior dispositions of faith, repentance, and a thankful remembrance of Christ's death, a person may "eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the

* *E.g.*, Bp. Jeremy Taylor, Bp. Wilson *et al.*

Sacrament with his mouth." Here the clear distinction is made between Spiritual Communion and Sacramental Communion, or, as it is called, "receiving the Sacrament with the mouth." It is with this act of Sacramental Communion that we are now chiefly concerned, for in this act the worshipper consummates his sacrifice. Sacramental Communion is necessary for the integrity of the sacrifice. This is shown by the stringent rule requiring Communion, which is so emphasized in the law and custom of the Church. It would seem that the ideal, the standard, the perfect Eucharist should include the Sacramental Communion of those present who are qualified to receive. But as Sacramental Communion is too sacred an act to be done without due preparation, the Church, that the Lord's command constantly to show forth His death may be obeyed, and yet that the holy mysteries may not be profaned by bad Sacramental Communion, has suffered such Communion to be numerically reduced to very low terms. That is to say, there may be a celebration with *very few* Sacramental Communion or even with but one. But that *one* there *must* be. The celebrant *must* receive. To whatever degree the ancient rules requiring reception may have lapsed into non-observance or may have been relaxed, reception by the celebrant has never been dispensed with. The priest

to offer duly must receive.* Communion then pertains to the perfection of sacrifice. It seems the special privilege and blessedness which a God of love has conferred upon the worship of His creatures.

In the typical sacrifices of the old time one of the chief features was the sacrificial meal. Two ideas were expressed by this, fellowship and joy, and that joy and fellowship were first of all the fellowship and joy of God with man. This eating of the sacrifice was especially conspicuous in connection with the peace-offerings, and still more especially with that variety of the peace-offerings which expressed thanksgiving, and which were therefore literally Eucharistic, as if foreshadowings and intimations of the true Eucharist of Christ Himself.†

The Shew-Bread was another marked type of Communion. Though consumed wholly by man it was first wholly dedicated to God.‡ In these offerings of which the worshipper partook the place of offering was not merely a table because man ate of the offerings. It had also the nature of an Altar, because before man could partake of them they must have been offered to God. There were offerings of which the worshipper

* Tolet: Concil. xii., Can. 5.

† "Worship of the Old Covenant," chap. iii., sect. vii.

‡ *Ibid.*, chap. viii., sect. iii.

did not partake, as for instance, the Burnt-Offering. And yet this victim ascending in fire to Heaven is called the "food of the offering made by fire for a sweet savor" (Lev. iii. 16). It is also called "the bread of God" (Lev. xxi. 6). God is spoken of as the partaker of this sacrifice, and so the place of offering is not only called an Altar, it is also called a table, although the partaker is not man but God.* These facts show us that table and Altar are both sacrificial terms, and are used together to express the full idea of sacrifice. The notion that there is any opposition between the two—that one is sacrificial and the other not—seems entirely a modern one.

Now our Blessed Lord unified and fulfilled all these separate rites and ideas. He calls Himself the "Bread of God" (S. John, vi. 33), and in Him God's eating, or acceptance of the sacrifice, and man's partaking of what is offered to God are made one act—Communion. And so an ancient Father says, "The participation of the divine mysteries is called Communion, because it gives us oneness with Christ, and admits us to the community of His Kingdom."†

Our Lord has ordained this Sacramental sacrifice in a form which would indicate its personal

* Ezek. xli. 22; xliv. 16.

† S. Isidore of Pelussium, quoted by Dr. Pusey: "Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 666.

appropriation by both the body and soul of the worshipper. Bread and wine are the simple but adequate representatives of the nourishment of the natural life. The relation to our life of nature into which we bring them as its aliment would seem to suggest, by analogy, some equally close relation of the inward part of the Sacrament to our higher life of soul and body.

Communion, then, is eating *with* God and *of* God. It declares vital union with God, a union of growth and development, a taking up of our substance into the Divine and heavenly. Communion is the sublimest act which mortal man is capable of doing. It is infinitely more than the intercourse and exchange of thought between kindred minds. It is far more than the interchange of affections and of intelligence. It is the fusion of life with life. It is the interpenetration of our being with the Divine Being. Think of the dreadful, overwhelming effect of God's glory and beauty. Even in this life we catch some faint intimations of the Divine manifestation. There are sights in nature, even in art, so grand and beautiful as to be oppressive and positively painful. There are effects of this kind which are purely moral. Wicked men are uncomfortable and ill at ease in the presence of the good and true. Simon Peter, good as men with men are good, overcome by a sudden sense of the majesty,

of the moral purity of Jesus Christ cried out, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!" It was the voice of tenderness and mercy, knowing whereof we are made, which declared: "There shall no man see My face and live." God is a consuming fire, because He is Holiness and Beauty. Without holiness no man shall see the Lord. Saul was struck to the ground and blinded by the glory of the light of the ascended Jesus, and we feel that the experience of the imperfect soul, in the wonderful "Dream of Gerontius," withering in the brightness of Love Divine and unable to bear that blaze, is true.

And yet God not only speaks to us; He enfolds the soul and we live. Communion is the embrace of God. One of the mysteries of Communion is that we live through it. It is veiled in a Sacrament. Otherwise we could never bear it.

We have not to enquire what we receive in the Holy Communion, but rather as to the effects of Communion on those who receive, for to such as worthily receive, it is, the Church asserts, a "divine and comfortable thing."

Hear then what our Lord Jesus Christ saith.

He says,* that His Body and Blood confer the gift of Everlasting Life. The meat which the

* S. John vi.

Son of Man giveth is the meat that endureth unto everlasting life. He is the Bread of Life. He is the true Bread from Heaven. A man may eat of this Bread and not die. If any man eat of this Bread he shall live forever. And except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you. But whoso eateth His Flesh and drinketh His Blood hath eternal life.

Next, the Body and Blood of Christ confer Happiness. "I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." Here is asserted the perfect satisfaction of all desires. No cravings that are not fully met. No aspirations which are not granted. The human heart is in perfect poise and equilibrium. It is in perfect peace. In this condition comes to pass the beatitude promised by Christ Himself, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." Again, Communion distinctly involves a Physical Perfection. It works not only spiritual but material bliss, for, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The consummation of the body is, therefore, a fruit of Communion.

Finally, the Lord declares that Union with Himself which is so profound and sacred that no

human imagination can conceive its honor and felicity, nor human tongue describe its sweetness. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me and I in Him."

"As the living Father hath sent Me and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me."

These words pass man's understanding. The mystery of the Divine life and relations, the oneness of the Father and the Son, are the archetypes of that mutual life of Christ and the faithful communicant who feeds upon Him.

Such is the Lord's own outline of the consequences of a good Communion—Vitality, Happiness, Resurrection in glory, and Union with Christ. S. Paul, to whom we must remember our Lord gave a special revelation on the Holy Eucharist, says that "We being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that One Bread." This is involved in our union with Christ. Being one with Him, we are knit together with each other.

So speaks Christ. Hear also what His Church saith. The benefits which we receive by Communion are said by the Church to be the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ. Fed with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, we are assured thereby of

God's favor and goodness toward us, and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of His Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of His everlasting Kingdom by the merits of the most precious death and passion of His dear Son. When the Church gives Communion, who can fail to be struck with the words she uses: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life;" "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Both parts of us, body and soul, are provided for, and brought, even during this stage of our existence, under the processes of everlasting life, with all which that implies of sanctity and splendor. Even now, compassed with infirmity of both the outward and the inner man, the Church would keep us mindful that whenever we approach the Altar we hasten the cleansing of the soul and the spiritualization of the body of our humiliation, for she teaches us that rightly eating the Flesh of Jesus Christ and drinking of His Blood, our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body and our souls washed through His most precious Blood, and we intensify our dwelling in Him and His in us.

Comparing the expressions of the Church with the words of our Lord, we must see that the

Church has not at all exaggerated or added to what her Head directly says, nor is there any evidence of her trying to speak more strongly than He did. She only fairly echoes the words of Christ Himself. He speaks definitely and wonderfully as to the virtue of Communion. Is it strange that with His voice declaring the Altar and its gifts, the Church should in exalted terms speak of the Body and Blood of Christ and call them Most Blessed and Most Precious? After what Christ Himself has said, is it strange that the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church discoursed as they have concerning this Blessed Sacrament and what is wrought by it in human souls? Is it strange that they have given to it glorious titles, and eulogized it as they have? Is it strange that they have called it "the Medicine of Immortality," * "the Corrective of the passions of our flesh,"† "the Honey-sweet Food,"‡ "Food which recruiteth the sick, recalleth the erring, raiseth up the fallen, which to the dying gives the pledge of immortality"? §

Taught by our Lord, it is only what we might have been expecting, to find the loving minds of His followers along the ages reading in the his-

* S. Ign. ad Eph. n. 20.

† S. Clement of Alex.

‡ Inscription at Autun.

§ Julius Firmicus, quoted by Dr. Pusey.

} Dr. Pusey: "The Real Presence
from the Fathers."

tory of the Old Testament a history of the power of His Body and Blood over human nature. In the Tree of Life, in the Bread and Wine which Melchisedec brought forth, in the white shower of Manna, in Gideon's Cake of barley bread, in the Cake which renewed Elijah's strength, in the widow's handful of Meal, in the Coal which purged Isaiah's lips, and in other types they saw foreshadowed their strength and refreshment who feed on Christ. In Him they found indeed how great were His Goodness and His Beauty, as in the Blessed Sacrament He fulfilled the prophecy that He should be the Corn of the Elect, and the Wine that blossoms into virgins.*

No treatise on Communion, in the effects attributed to Christ's sacred Body and Blood, can well go beyond the depth and fulness of Christ's own words. He, in the Blessed Sacrament, is the True Manna, the Bread from Heaven, the Food of Angels, the Bread containing in itself all sweetness.

All the theologians, poets, and sacred orators of the Catholic Church have found in the words of Christ Himself the justification of everything they say in regard to the benefits of our partaking of Christ's Flesh and Blood. From Him they learned to look for strength, and joy, and purity, and love as fruits of Communion. If the soul is

* Zech. ix. 17: *Vulgate*.

struggling with temptation, weighed down by care or sorrow, if faith be languishing and shaken, the Body of Christ is the Bread by which out of weakness strength may come, and His Precious Blood is the Chalice which overflows with hope and gladness.

Those who are accustomed to observe and study the spiritual life recognize at once those who feed upon the Bread of Life. They perceive in them a certain quality felt far better than it can be described. There is an intensity, an enthusiasm about them which are the results of Communion—the enthusiasm, the intensity of the Divine life. Kneeling at the Altar they are filled with grace and heavenly benediction. Christ dwells in them and they in Him. They have a firmer grasp than others on spiritual and unseen things. They have more insight into the invisible. They can bear more. They have more patience. The world, its ways, its maxims, and its rewards have a looser hold on them than on others. They have more perseverance. They make, and are capable of, greater self-sacrifices than others. Now all this is love. God is love. They have touched God. They have hid their life in Him with Christ. Therefore they love with a fervor which can come from no other source. The higher substance takes up the lower into itself. “He that eateth Me even he shall

live by Me." That is the philosophy of Communion. Christ changes the devout communicant into Himself. You cannot eat Christ without being changed into Christ. The very structure of your being is altered by Communion. This has ever been the experience of Christians, who, kept from serious aberration by the supernatural guidance of the Holy Ghost within the Church, have followed the teaching of Jesus Christ. That experience of the Christian world has ever testified to the powerful effects of Communion in the enrichment and transformation of the soul. And for this reason the Christian sense has seen that it is the soul's daily right and need. The Body of Christ is the daily portion. The Communion of Christ's Body is the answer to the prayer of the children of God, "Give us this day our daily bread."

"After the Kingdom of Heaven," says an ancient Father,* "who would ask for temporal bread? But daily and every day He would have us ask for bread for our journey in the Sacrament of His Body, that by it we may attain unto endless day." And in like strain of the chalice says another,† "The Only-Begotten hath come, hath come! and so declares our Mother Church, the quiet harbor of peace, the sweetness that

* S. Peter Chrysologus: Dr. Pusey, *ut supra*.

† S. Epiphanius, *ibid*.

'breathes of the bloom of the vine,' and gives to us the cluster of blessing, and that offers to us day by day the draught which lightens toil, the Blood of Christ, unmixed and true."

The most signal triumphs of Christ's soldiers and servants over sin, the world, and the devil have been won in the courage and inspiration of His own Body and Blood. This is illustriously shown in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles. In their holiness and dauntless fortitude and love to one another we must not forget that the Holy Ghost led them daily to the Altar. They continued steadfastly in the breaking of the Bread. And in its strength and refreshment they stood before kings and were not ashamed, calmly facing whatever man might do unto them.

Christ's Body was then and is now the support of those who, though they must be in the world, would yet not be *of* the world. Engrossed with the necessary cares, burdened with the toils and griefs of this life, they must work out their salvation. What shall defend them from the corruption that is in the world, so that they may pass through it as strangers and pilgrims, without forgetting or dishonoring their citizenship in Heaven? The Body of Christ. That is, as the manna was, the pilgrim's meat. The manna was the daily constant bread, and the True Manna is no less our Bread for every day. It is the force,

the motive power, of the Christian life. As S. Ambrose says, "A figure of the Lord's Body was foreshowed when the Lord rained manna upon the fathers in the wilderness, or even as that bread led the people through the wilderness to the Promised Land, so this celestial food carrieth the faithful, who are passing through this world's wilderness to Heaven. Whence rightly is it called the *Viaticum*, because it refresheth us on our journey even until it bringeth us to our native land." *

As we touch Christ in His Sacrament we are concerned not only with the marvels of present grace, but with those of future glory. Communion is the greatest and most real witness to the resurrection of the flesh. Every good communion is an addition to the degrees of power, to the rays of glory in which the body shall be raised. "He Himself feeds and refreshes us," says † S. Ambrose again; "Thou gatherest there the new flower which giveth forth the sweet smell of the resurrection; thou gatherest the lily, that is, the brightness of eternity; thou gatherest the rose, that is, the Blood of the Lord's Body."

Most glorious among the galaxy of the resurrection stars will shine those who have made the best Communions. They who have been the

* S. Thomas Aquinas: "Sacrament of the Altar," chap. xxiii.

† Dr. Pusey, *ut supra*.

truest and most loving children of the Altar will wear the most radiant aureoles when Christ shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day.

We are not worthy to gather up the crumbs under God's Table, and yet "truly our fellowship (Communion) is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." *

What a heritage is this supreme revelation of the love of God! The Holy Eucharist is the voice, and reality, and life of the world to come, that world which is to replace this one. It is the witness of the Atonement, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection. It attests what God has done, and is doing, and will yet do to heal the hurt of His people. It declares that the restitution of all things has begun.

There is nothing heard on this earth like the † voice of the Blessed Sacrament. The world is faithless, and hopeless, and loveless. It boasts, and scoffs, and sneers, and curses, and despairs. But the Holy Eucharist is a perpetual voice of joy, and health, and hope and promise. Through all the pain, and tears, and darkness of this world, there comes from the Altar a continual thanksgiving. "We should at all times and in all places

* 1 John i. 3.

† "Over against pessimism it [the Church] lifts up a perpetual Eucharist."—"Lux Mundi:" Essay on the Church.

give thanks unto Thee, O Lord." They who live of the Altar are never dismayed. They know that the heaviness endures but for the night, now far spent, and that soon the morning cometh, when all will see that Jesus is standing on the shore.

And yet as we glance over the land and note the closed churches, and the Altars silent and deserted even on the first day of the week, we must confess how far from conscious of her goodly heritage our Church yet seems to be. We have inherited a vast system of prevailing appeal to God, and of spiritual sustenance to the soul, which we do not begin to use.

One of the great duties to which God calls us is the restoration of the Blessed Sacrament to its primitive place as the worship and life of the Church. We need more Altars, but before that we want more celebrations and more and better Communion at the Altars which we already have. All can set forward this great work by their own Communion, by their prayers, their alms, their fastings, their repentance, their influence and their example. We should aim to secure to every Church a celebration at least every Sunday. And wherever possible we should do our utmost to establish the daily celebration of the Holy Sacrifice.

What a work, gentlemen, you have it in your

power to accomplish right here in this great metropolis! What are all these great Churches for, which you are rearing, if not, as * S. Paul exhorted, "first of all" to make giving of thanks, Eucharists, for all men, to plead day by day the merits of Christ's Sacrifice, and to hold out to hungry, fainting souls the Bread of Life, the Daily Bread?

Not that we would have our pulpits preach less, but we would have our Altars preach more. We are continually urging the pulpit to put forth its preaching capacity. Let us utilize the preaching capacity of the Altar. It would solve many of the hard questions and supply many of the pressing needs for which we vainly seek answer and supply.

God speed the day when in every Church the Altar shall be daily used to speak to and to feast with God, when every Church shall be an open Church, where Jesus may be always found to bless the sick and dying, and to welcome all who turn aside from the noisy paths of men to seek His Face.

* 1 Tim. ii. 1.

APPENDIX.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

NOTE I.—In the early Church this Sacrament was known by many names. It was sometimes simply called Sacrifice, Oblation, Eucharist, and again Reasonable and Unbloody Sacrifice, Sacrifice of the Altar, Sacrifice of our Ransom, Sacrifice of our Mediator, and Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. This nomenclature was adopted advisedly by holy men even at a time when the bloody and material sacrifices of the heathen had not ceased in the civilized world. Everywhere in the early ages of Christianity were the words of Malachi understood as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice. Not in one place, like the Sacrifices of the Law, but in every place, on countless altars, and among all nations is the Pure Offering, the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist offered to-day by the Church in obedience to the command of her Divine Head.

NOTE II.—Speaking of the Eucharistic Sacrifice that great Bishop, Jeremy Taylor, uses the following language: “Now what Christ does in Heaven, He hath commanded us to do on earth, that is to represent His death, to commemorate the sacrifice by humble prayer and thankful record; and by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist to lay it before the eyes of our Heavenly Father, so ministering in His Priesthood, and doing according to His commandment and His example; the Church being the image of Heaven; the priest, the minister of Christ; the holy table being a copy of the celestial Altar; and the eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being always the same, it bleeds no more after

the finishing of it on the Cross; but it is wonderfully represented in Heaven, and graciously represented here; by Christ's action there, by His commandment here." *The Worthy Communicant, Vol. III., p. 871. Ed. Lond. 1835.*

NOTE III.—Before giving specimens of patristic allusions to the sacrificial nature of the Holy Eucharist, it is worth while to notice the weighty facts adduced by Bishop Forbes, when he says: "The Breaking of the Bread and the Prayers," which are the terms used for the worship of the primitive Church, have from the beginning been invested with a sacrificial character. The Greek original of the New Testament brings this out much more strongly than the English translation. Thus in the Acts of the Holy Apostles, the expression, "as they were ministering," is rendered by the hieratic word *λειτουργούντων*; the Christian ministers in the person of Christ *τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργῶς* ("minister of the sanctuary," Heb. viii. 2, A. V.) are *διακόνοι τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης* ("ministers of the New Testament" 2 Cor. iii. 6, A. V.); the worship of the Church of the Gentiles as elected on the ruin of the Jews is the *πρόσφορα τῶν ἐθνῶν*; not only *εὐχαι* and *δεήσεις* ("prayers and supplication") but *εὐχαριστίαι* are to be offered for all men (1 Timothy ii. 1); it is asserted that *ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον* ("we have an altar," Heb. xiii. 10, A. V.); the old Levitical words *adscara* "sacrificial commemoration," rendered *ἀνάμνησις*, and *asah*, rendered *ποιεῖν* by the LXX., are adopted by Christianity; (these words *ἀνάμνησις* and *ποιεῖν* are used by our Lord in the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, and are rendered in our English Bibles "*Remembrance*" and "*Do*." S. Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24—G. McC. F.) and S. Paul, animated entirely by the sacerdotal idea, calls himself *λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, λειτουργούντα το εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.* Accordingly in the very earliest ages, we find such ex-

pressions, προσφορά, θυσία, λειτουργία, *Oblatio, Sacrificium Dominicum, Dominicum*, freely used, and the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist is clearly stated by S. Clement of Rome, and by S. Ignatius. S. Justin speaks of the Eucharistic Sacrifice being pre-signified by the Pure Offering mentioned by the Prophet Malachi. S. Irenæus, after relating the institution, adds this remark: "Thus Jesus Christ has established the Sacrifice of the New Testament, which the Church offers to God throughout the whole world, according to the teaching handed down by the Apostles." S. Iren. iv. 18, n. 4. He states that it is the Word, Who is offered in this Sacrifice.

Origen asserts that "in the Christian Churches there is a Sacrifice, at once commemorative and propitiatory, that is to say the Eucharist." *In Lev. Hom. xiii. n. 3. Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Art. XXXI.* "Now the Offerings and Ministrations (τάς τε προσφοράς καὶ λειτουργίας) He commanded to be performed with care and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. . . . They therefore that make their offerings (προσφοράς) at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed." *S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, 40.*

"For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblameably and holily." *Ibid., 44—note 8 on the Greek text, "What does Clement mean by sacrifices, by gifts (δῶρα), and offerings (προσφοράς)? etc."*

"If any one be not within the precincts of the Altar (θυσιαστήριον), he lacketh the Bread of God." *S. Ignatius to the Ephesians, v.*

"Hasten to come together all of you, as to one temple, even God; as to one Altar, even to one Jesus Christ." *S. Ign. to the Magnesians, vii.*

"Be ye careful therefore to observe One Eucharist (for

there is One Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and One Cup unto union in His Blood ; there is one Altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow-servants), that whatsoever ye do, ye may do it after God." *S. Ign. to the Philadelphians, iv.*

The above extracts are from Bp. Lightfoot's edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

"Hence God speaks thus, as I said before, by Malachi, one of the twelve prophets, of the sacrifices then offered by you: *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I accept your offerings at your hands; for from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My Name hath been glorified among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto My Name and a Pure Offering; for My Name is great among the heathen, saith the Lord, but ye profane it.*" (Mal. i. 10-12.)

"With regard to these sacrifices which are offered to Him in every place by us Gentiles, that is of the Eucharistical Bread and equally of the Eucharistical Cup, He then foretold that we should glorify His Name, but that you should profane it."

"God has therefore beforehand declared, that all who through this Name offer these sacrifices, which Jesus, Who is the Christ, commanded to be offered, that is to say in the Eucharist of the Bread and of the Cup, which are offered in every part of the world by us Christians, are well pleasing to Him. But those sacrifices which are offered by you, and through these priests of yours, He wholly rejects, saying, *And I will not accept these offerings at your hands. For from the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, My Name is glorified among the Gentiles; but ye profane it.*" *S. Justin Martyr, Dial. Tryph., 41, 117. Oxford Library of the Fathers.*

"But every Lord's Day do you gather yourselves to-

gether, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. . . . For this is that, which was spoken by the Lord: In every place and time offer to Me a Pure Sacrifice; for I am a Great King, saith the Lord, and My name is wonderful among the nations." *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, chap. xiv. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Am. Ed. vii. 381.*

"Then after having completed the spiritual sacrifice, the bloodless *λατρεία* upon that sacrifice of propitiation we invoke God for the common peace of the Churches; for the good condition of the World; for Kings; for soldiers and allies; for those who are infirm; for those who are heavy laden; and in sum for all who need assistance we all pray and offer this sacrifice. Then we remember also those who have fallen asleep before, first the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; that God by their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications; then also for the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before, and for all those in fine, who have fallen asleep before among us; believing that there will be the greatest profit to the souls for whom the supplication is offered up whilst the holy and most awful sacrifice lies before us." *S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Lectures, Lecture xxiii., Sections 7-9.*

"We offer Jesus Christ immolated for our sins." *Ibid. Sect. 10.*

"And behold the corpse was carried to its burial; we went and returned without tears. For neither in those prayers which we poured forth unto Thee, when the Sacrifice of our Ransom was offered for her, when now the corpse was by the grave's side, as the manner there is, previous to its being laid therein, did I weep even during these prayers." *S. Aug. Conf. B., ix. ¶ 32. Oxford Library of the Fathers, i., 178.*

"Thus He (Christ) is both the Priest, who offers, and the Sacrifice offered. And He designed that there should be a daily sign of this in the Sacrifice of the Church, which being His Body learns to offer herself through Him. Of this true Sacrifice the ancient sacrifices of the saints were the various and numerous signs; and it was thus variously figured, just as one thing is signified by a variety of words, that there may be less weariness when we speak of it much. To this supreme and true sacrifice all false sacrifices have given place. *S. Aug., City of God, bk. x., chap. xx. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, Am. Ed., ii., 193.*

"The Hebrews in their animal sacrifices, which they, offered to God in many varied forms, suitably to the significance of the institution, typified the sacrifice offered by Christ. This sacrifice is also commemorated by Christians in the sacred offering and participation of the Body and Blood of Christ." *S. Aug., Reply to Faustus, xx., 18. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, Am. Ed., iv., 261.*

"There stands the priest, not bringing down fire from Heaven, but the Holy Spirit; and he makes prolonged supplication, not that some flame sent down from on high may consume the offerings, but that grace descending on the sacrifice may thereby enlighten the souls of all, and render them more refulgent than silver purified by fire." *S. Chrysostom, On the Priesthood, bk. iii., chap. 4. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, ix., 47.*

"For this end are fasting and Lent appointed, and so many days of solemn assemblies, auditories, prayers, and teachings, in order that by this earnestness being cleansed in every possible way from the sins which we had contracted during the whole year, we may with spiritual boldness religiously partake of that unbloody Sacrifice." *S. Chrysostom, On the Statues, Hom. xx, ch. 1. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, ix., 471.*

"What sayest thou? There is the sacrifice in hand and all things laid out duly ordered. Angels are there present, archangels, the Son of God is there; all stand with such awe, and in the general silence those (the deacons) stand by, crying aloud; and thinkest thou that what is done is done in vain?" *S. Chrysostom, Acts of the Apostles, Hom. xxi. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, xi., 140.*

"When he that is over the Church cometh in, he straightway says, 'Peace unto all;' when he preacheth, 'Peace unto all;' when he blesseth, 'Peace unto all;' when he biddeth to salute 'Peace unto all;' when the Sacrifice is finished, 'Peace unto all;' and again in the middle, 'Grace to you and Peace.'" *S. Chrysostom, Homilies on Colossians, Hom. iii. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, xiii., 273.*

"The Mystery at Easter is not of more efficacy than that which is now celebrated. It is one and the same. There is the same grace of the Spirit, it is always a Pass-over. You who are initiated know this. On the Preparation, on the Sabbath, on the Lord's Day, and on the Day of Martyrs, it is the same Sacrifice that is performed. 'For as often,' He saith, 'as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death.' No time is limited for the performance of this sacrifice." *S. Chrysostom, Homilies on Timothy, Hom. v. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers, xiii., 425.*

No. 81 of Tracts of the Times—*Catena Patrum*—is a most valuable collection of the "Testimony of Later English Writers to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

NOTE IV.—Prayer for the Faithful Departed, as conspicuous objects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, is one of the most prominent features of Catholic Liturgies. *E. g.* The Liturgy of S. Mark:

"Give rest to the souls of our fathers and brethren that

have heretofore slept in the faith of CHRIST, O LORD our GOD, remembering our ancestors, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, holy and just persons, every spirit that has departed in the faith of CHRIST, and those whom to-day we keep in memory (and our holy father, Mark, the Apostle and Evangelist, who made known to us the way of Salvation.) . . . *The Deacon reads the Diptychs of the departed. The Priest bows down and prays:* And to the spirits of all these give rest, our Master, LORD and GOD, in the Tabernacles of Thy Saints, vouchsafing to them in Thy Kingdom the good things of Thy promise, which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and it hath not entered into the heart of man, the things, which Thou hast prepared, O GOD, for them that love Thy holy name. Grant rest to their souls, and vouchsafe to them the Kingdom of Heaven." *Translation of Primitive Liturgies, Neale and Littledale, pp. 17, 18.*

On the above passage Dr. Neale remarks: "Observe here (1) one of the many examples of prayers for the dead as an Isapostolic practice; (2) that nevertheless, every single expression contained in them militates against the doctrine of a purgatory—*i. e.* in the sense of a place of pain.

The Liturgy of S. James:

"Grant that our oblations may be well pleasing to Thee and hallowed by the Holy Ghost, for a propitiation of our transgressions, and of the ignorances of the people, and for the repose of the souls that have fallen asleep." *Neale and Littledale, ut supra, p. 46.*

The Liturgy of S. Chrysostom:

"And further we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have departed in the faith, our ancestors, Fathers, Patriarchs, Apostles, Preachers, Evan-

Belists, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith." *Neale and Littledale, ut supra*, p. 116.

For an easily accessible collection of Prayers for the Dead from the Liturgies the reader is referred to Appendix II. of the above work of Neale and Littledale, and to Chapter V. of Dr. F. G. Lee's "Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed."

NOTE V.—The XXXI. Article of Religion does not declare against the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Altar, but censures an erroneous view of that doctrine.

Palmer in his Treatise on the Church says: * "The Thirty-First Article is directed against the vulgar and heretical doctrine of the reiteration of Christ's Sacrifice in the Eucharist. It was those 'missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur sacerdotem offerri Christum in remissionem pœnæ, aut culpæ, pro vivis et defunctis' which are pronounced 'blasphema figmenta et perniciosæ imposturæ;' but not 'missarum sacrificia' as understood by the fathers, and in an orthodox sense. The article was directed against the errors maintained and countenanced by such men as Soto, Hardinge, etc., who by rejecting the doctrine of a sacrifice by way of commemoration and consecration, and not literally identical with that on the Cross, and by their crude and objectionable mode of expression, countenanced the vulgar error that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist or Mass was in every respect equal to that of Christ upon the Cross, and that it was in fact either a reiteration or a continuation of that Sacrifice" (actively a continuation). "The Article was not directed against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as explained by Bossuet, Veron, and others, with which we have no material fault to find."

* Part VI., Ch. X.

The Church of Rome, in fairness, should be acquitted of the charge of authoritatively teaching the false and heretical doctrine condemned by this Article, whatever may have been the prevalent view among the masses of her adherents upon the subject.

NOTE VI.—“We find no debates or disputes concerning the Presence of Christ’s Body in the Sacrament, and much less concerning the *manner* of his Presence, for the first 800 years.”

“The first doubt about the Presence of Christ’s Body in the Sacrament seems to have been moved not long before the year 900.” *Anglo-Catholic Library, Bramhall’s Works, vol. i., pp. 9 and 11.*

NOTE VII.—Whatever may be thought of the Church’s teaching of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and of the Real Objective Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, it is the plainest matter of fact that they are the doctrines of the Ancient Liturgies and the Early Fathers to whose authority the Church of England makes constant appeal. In the Canons of 1571, the Clergy are enjoined: “Never teach aught in sermon to be religiously held . . . but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected from that very doctrine.” The Canons of 1604 repeatedly recognize their authority. In Canon XXX. certain rules of doctrine are pronounced true “which are consonant to the Word of God and the judgment of the Ancient Fathers.” The Book of Homilies is characterized by its frequent appeal to the learned and godly doctors of the Primitive Church and by expressions of admiration and respect for the voice of antiquity. In short, the appeal to antiquity, a reliance on the Vincentian Canon (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum*

est),* and a strict adherence to the historical method are the keynotes of the Catholic and Anglican position.

These Catholic witnesses speak on this wise :

"They ("the Docetæ, who denied that our Lord had a true body"—Dr. Pusey) abstain from Eucharist and prayer because they allow not that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which Flesh suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His Goodness raised up." *Epistle of S. Ignatius to the Smyrnæans*, 6. *Bp. Lightfoot's Ed.*

"Be ye careful therefore to observe One Eucharist (for there is One Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and One Cup unto union in His Blood ; there is One Altar)." *S. Ign. to the Philadelphians*, 4. *Bp. Lightfoot.*

"For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these ; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus, who was made flesh." *First Apol. of S. Justin Martyr*, chap. lxvi. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Am. Reprint, vol. i., p. 85.

"The Bread and Wine of the Eucharist before the holy invocation of the Adorable Trinity was simple bread and wine, while after the invocation the bread becomes the Body and the wine the Blood of Christ." *S. Cyril Catech.*, *Lectures xix.*, 7. *Oxford Library of the Fathers*, ii., 260-1.

"Therefore with fullest assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ ; for in the figure of bread is given to thee His Body, and in the figure of wine His

* *S. Vinc. Lerin. Com.*, Cap. II.

Blood; that thou, by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, mightest be made of the same body and the same blood with Him. For thus we come to bear Christ in us, because His Body and Blood are diffused through our members; thus it is that, according to the blessed Peter, *we become partakers of the Divine Nature.*" S. Cyril Catech., Lect. xxii., 3.

And the author of the De Sacramentis (probably a Bishop and disciple of S. Ambrose) writes: "How can that which is bread be the Body of Christ? By Consecration. And the Consecration, in whose words is it? The Lord Jesus. For all the rest which has been said before is said by the priest; praises are offered to God; prayer is made for the people, for kings, for the rest. When the Venerable Sacrament is to be consecrated, the priest now no longer uses his own words, but he uses the words of Christ. So then, the word of Christ consecrates the Sacrament. What is the word of Christ? That by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, the heaven was made; the Lord commanded, and the earth was made; the Lord commanded, and the seas were made; the Lord commanded, and all the creatures were brought forth. Thou seest, then, how powerful in working is the Word of Christ. If, then, there is such power in the Word of the Lord Jesus, that those things which were not should begin to be, how much more is it operative that the things which *were should still be, and be changed into something else!* . . . So, then, that I may answer thee, it was not the Body of Christ before the Consecration, but after the Consecration I say to thee that now it is the Body of Christ. 'He spake and it was made; He commanded and it was created.' . . . Before it is consecrated it is bread; when the words of Christ are added, it is the Body of Christ. Then hear Himself saying, 'Take and eat ye all

of this, for this is my Body.' And before the words of Christ, it is a cup full of wine and water; when the words of Christ have operated, the Blood of Christ is caused to be there, which redeemed His people." *S. Ambrose's Works. Paris, 1686, etc., 2 vols. folio. 2d vol., chap. iv., Sect. 14, 15, 16, p. 368; chap. v., Sect. 23, p. 370.*

For a very full summary of primitive testimony to the Real Presence the reader is referred to Dr. Pusey's noble work, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," Oxford, 1855. Of the overwhelming mass of evidence therein shown, Dr. Pusey says: "The following evidence that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first, is more than enough to convince one who is willing to be convinced. . . . The English Church certainly believed that there is a definite testimony to the faith, plainly recognizable in Christian antiquity, so that no one who wished to know the facts could fail to discern them." *Pp. 316-317.*

NOTE VIII.—As to the effect of Consecration and its accomplishment by the power of the Holy Ghost, S. Iræneus says:

"For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the Invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity." *Against Heresies, bk. xiv., ch. viii., 5. Anti-Nic. Christian Library, Edin., vol. v., p. 435.*

And S. Cyril of Jerusalem:

"Then having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we call upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him; that He may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine

the Blood of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed." *Catech., Lect. xxiii., 7; Oxford Library, 7; ii., 275.*

Saint Nilus, a disciple of Saint Chrysostom, writes: "A leaf of paper made of papyrus and size, is called mere (*ψιλος*) paper; but when it receives the signature of the Emperor, it is (as is well known) called *sacra*; so conceive with me also of the Divine mysteries, that before the intercession of the priest and the descent of the Holy Ghost, the oblations are mere (*ψιλον*) bread and common (*κοινων*) wine; but after those dread invocations and the coming of the Adorable, Good, and Life-giving Spirit, the oblations laid on the Holy Table, are no more mere (*ψιλον*) bread and common (*κοινων*) wine, but the precious and immaculate Body and Blood of Christ, the God of all." *Migne, Patrologiæ Græcæ, tom. 79, p. 103.*

Saint Gregory of Nyssa says in the same way: "The bread again is thus far common bread, but when the mystery consecrates it, it is called and it becomes the Body of Christ." *Migne, Patrologiæ Græcæ, tom. 46, p. 582.*

Saint Athanasius writes: "Thou wilt see the Levites (Deacons) bearing bread and a cup of wine; and so long as the supplications and prayers have not yet taken place bare (*ψιλος*) is the bread and cup; but when the great and wonderful prayers have been completed over it, then the bread becometh the Body and the cup the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." *Sermo ad Baptizat.* "Quoted by *Eutych. de Pasch. in Card. Mai Biblioth. Nov. iv., 62; also in Scriptt. Vett. Vat. Coll., ix., 623.*" *Pusey's Doctrine of Real Presence from the Fathers, p. 237.*

The Ancient Liturgies bear testimony also to the same belief.

"Send down then on us, and on these loaves, and on these cups, Thy Holy Ghost, that He may sanctify and

perfect them, as God Almighty. And make this Bread the Body." (*Liturgy of Saint Mark*.)

In the Liturgy of Saint James the words are: "Send down the same most Holy Ghost, Lord, upon us, and upon these holy and proposed gifts, that coming upon them with His Holy and good and glorious presence, He may hallow and make this bread the Holy Body of Thy Christ. . . . And this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ." In the Liturgy of Saint Chrysostom we read: "And make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ . . . and that which is in this cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ . . . changing them by Thy Holy Ghost."

Translations of the Primitive Liturgies, Neale and Littledale, pp. 24, 51, 115.

NOTE IX.—The difference between Catholic and Roman teaching on this subject does not concern the Presence itself but the mode or manner of the presence. The question is not as to whether there be a change, but whether there be such a change that the material substance of the elements ceases to be.

Thorndike writes in his treatise on the Laws of the Church: "As it is by no means to be denied that the elements are really changed, translated, turned, and converted into the Body and Blood of Christ . . . yet is not this change destructive to the bodily substance of the elements but cumulative of them, with the Spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood." *Thorndike's Works, vol. iv., p. 82. Anglo-Catholic Library.*

With regard to our differences with Rome on the subject of the Eucharist, "All controversy is about the mode," says the saintly Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester. The same views are frequently expressed by others of the Caroline Divines, such as Bishops Montague, Bilson, Morton, and Overall, the latter the author of that

part of the Catechism which treats of the Sacraments. "Abate us Transubstantiation," says Bramhall, "and those things which are consequents of their determination of the manner of Presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular." *Bramhall's Works*, vol. iii., p. 165. *Anglo-Catholic Library*.

"I cannot see where there is any real difference betwixt us" (and the Church of Rome) "about this Real Presence if we would give over the study of contradiction, and understand one another right." Thus writes Bishop Cosin, in his notes on the book of Common Prayer, and adds, "So have I heard my Lord Overall preach it a hundred times." *Anglo-Catholic Library*, *Cosin's Works*, vol. v., p. 155.

Cosin also writes: "It is confessed by all Divines that upon the words of Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ is really substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it." *Ibid.*, p. 131.

Laud in his controversy with Fisher agrees that there is a substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ after Consecration, but objects to the word "conversion" as descriptive of the change which takes place. *Vol. ii.*, p. 322, *Laud's Works*. *Anglo-Catholic Library*.

NOTE X.—The following is from Appendix II., to Dr. John Mason Neale's "Translation of the Venerable Sacrament of the Altar:"

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In Article XXVIII., the Church of England says as follows:

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words

of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

In this sentence we must notice :

1. That not all change whatsoever, but the change of the *substance* of bread and wine in the Eucharist is denied.
2. That it is denied on four grounds :
 - (i.) Because it cannot be proved from Holy Writ.
 - (ii.) Because it is opposed to the plain words of Scripture.
 - (iii.) Because it overthrows the nature of a Sacrament.
 - (iv.) Because it has given occasion to many superstitions.

It is evident that the entire meaning of this denial depends on the signification of the word "substance ;" this word bears two distinct and almost contrary meanings: the popular and the scholastic.

1. The popular meaning of the word is well known to all of us ; if we see something black of which we do not know the name, we speak of it as a "black substance ;" if, in like manner, we taste something sweet, we call it "a sweet substance ;" by this we mean "that the thing which we see or taste is black or sweet ;" we make no nice distinction in our mind between one part of the "thing" and another, but by "substance" we simply mean the whole thing as it is *apprehended by our senses*.

2. Scholastically, "substance" has a very different meaning ; it means, not the whole thing as apprehended by our senses, but the invisible, inward, and secret power or part of the "thing," the presence of which is signified by the outward signs, qualities, or properties of it ; these outward signs are called "accidents." A thing may be black, sweet, heavy, cold, these are not its "substance," but its "accidents." The substance underlies them all, as it were, and makes the thing to be what it is. In this

sense of the word we can neither taste, touch, see, nor hear the "substance" of a thing; our senses can apprehend its "accidents" only.

It would appear that in Article XXVIII., as quoted above, the Church of England uses the word "substance" in the first, or popular sense, and consequently means to deny that Consecration effects any change in the bread and wine as far as what is cognizable by the senses is concerned; and by implication to assert that after Consecration the bread and wine remain in their original natural state, in so far as they are subject to the senses. That is to say, no change is wrought which our senses are miraculously withheld from discerning, but the bread and wine are truly testified by our senses to be such after the Act of Consecration.

That this is the meaning which substance is intended to bear in the quotation would seem to be the case, when it is considered:

1. That the Articles were very much directed against popular errors (see *quibus vulgo dicebatur* in Art. XXX.), and therefore it is natural that words should be used more in a popular than a strictly scholastic sense.

2. That the English writers of the period during which the Articles were written and moulded into their present form, and even subsequently too, were seldom scholastically exact in their use of the word "substance." For instance, Hooker, one of the most learned and painstaking of Anglican divines, in a well-known passage, speaking of the Eucharist, says: "this Bread hath in It more then the *substance* which our eyes behold" (Eccles. Pol., b. v., c. lxviii., 12). It would be nonsense to talk of our eyes beholding the "substance" of anything in the strict scholastic sense of the word. But Hooker never wrote nonsense, and so it is plain he uses the word in the

more popular sense, in which it is credible that it is used in the Anglican formularies.

3. That only the popular sense of the word "substance" would give force to the four reasons for refusing to credit a change of "substance" adduced by the Article. And against the doctrine of a change of "substance" thus understood, the four reasons are cogent enough.

(i.) No single passage of Holy Writ can be quoted to prove that the Eucharistic Consecration effects the smallest change in any natural quality of the Bread and Wine.

(ii.) Scripture, by speaking of the Consecrated Sacrament as Bread and the Fruit of the Vine (S. Mark. xiv. 25; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 26-29), shows in "plain words" they are still in a true sense Bread and Wine, which they would not be had they lost any of their natural qualities.

(iii.) A Sacrament must have an outward and visible part, and an inward and invisible part; if the truth of the outward and visible part of the Eucharist is destroyed by the change of some of the natural qualities of the Bread and Wine, its perfection as a Sacrament is injured.

(iv.) Many revolting and superstitious uses of the Eucharist are recorded, which plainly show that, in the minds of those that practised them, the natural qualities of the Bread and Wine had been transmuted into something above nature.

But, on the other hand, if "substance" be understood in the strict scholastic meaning of the word, it can hardly be true to say that the Article forbids us to believe in a doctrine of Transubstantiation, or is directed against the belief that Consecration changes the hidden, unseen nature of the Bread and Wine.

1. Because the four reasons adduced do not touch such a doctrine:

(i.) CHRIST says, "This is My Body," "This is My

BLOOD:" the Bread and Wine of which He spoke were not His Body and Blood before He gave the consecrating Word; that Word, then, must have in some sense changed them; but it did not change them outwardly or accidentally; then it must have changed them inwardly or substantially. Transubstantiation, *thus understood*, can be proved from Holy Writ.

(ij.) If by Transubstantiation we thus mean that the outward parts of the Bread and Wine remain, in all points, in their original nature, while inwardly, and by a supernatural change, they become the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the doctrine is in no way repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.

(iii.) Nor does this doctrine overthrow the nature of a Sacrament, for it maintains the duality of the Sacrament in its full integrity.

(iv.) Nor have any superstitions arisen, as far as is known, from such a belief.

2. Because Transubstantiation, as just explained, would seem to be the very doctrine taught by the Church of England herself, in her formularies and Catechism:

The Church of England teaches that in order that the Bread and Wine may become the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST they must be consecrated by a Priest; the special agent implying something special in the act.

In the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST she teaches that there are two things:

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|
| I. | { An outward part or sign.
Accidents. | { Bread and Wine |
| II. | { An inward part or thing
signified.
Substance. | { Body and Blood of
CHRIST. |

That is :

In Prayer-Book language. Before Consecration there is on the Altar mere bread and wine, both as respects the outward part or sign, and the inward part or thing signified ; after Consecration there is still bread and wine as regards the outward part or sign, but the Body and Blood of CHRIST has become the inward part, or thing signified.

In Scholastic language. Before Consecration there is on the Altar mere bread and wine, both accidentally and substantially ; after Consecration, bread and wine accidentally, the Body and Blood of CHRIST substantially.

Latin divines, from the mediæval age downwards, are accustomed to use the word "substance" *only* in its strict scholastic sense. This should always be carefully borne in mind in reading their works, or their meaning, when they employ the word either by itself, or included in the word "Transubstantiation," may be seriously misconceived."

NOTE XI.—The Greek Church uses the term Transubstantiation, but, it would seem, in a far less definite and formal sense than the Latin Communion. Article XVII., "Of the Holy Eucharist," of the Council of Bethlehem (1672) says: "When we use the word Transubstantiation, we by no means think it explains the mode in which the bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of the Lord, for this is altogether incomprehensible and impossible for any to understand but God alone, and the attempt to understand it can only be the result of irreverence and impiety."

In notes on this article in his "*History of the Holy Eastern Church, General, Introduction*," vol. ii., pp. 1173, 1174, Dr. Neale says: "I quote from the Larger Russian Catechism. . . . In the Exposition of the Faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said that the word Transubstan-

tiation is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord: for this none can understand but God; but only thus much is signified, that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true Body of the LORD, and the wine the very Blood of our LORD."

"The Russian Church has evidently determined to decline the use, or the distinction of the *οὐσία* (substance) and the *συμβεβηκότα* of the bread and wine; which the Council of Bethlehem brought prominently forward."

NOTE XII.—Saint Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Judge not the matter from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgivings that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ." *Lecture xxii., section vi. Catechetical Lectures, Oxford Library, chap. iii., p. 34.*

And Bishop Cosin tells us that "Yet our faith does not cause or make that presence but apprehends it as most true and really effected by the word of Christ. And the faith whereby we are said to eat the Flesh of Christ is not that only whereby we believe that He died for our sins (for this faith is required to suppose and precede the sacramental manducation) but more properly that whereby we believe these words of Christ, 'This is My Body.'" *Anglo-Catholic Library, Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 171.*

NOTE XIII.—Instances of the employment of Eucharistic Doctrine in defence of the Incarnation are found in the case of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies. The former of these divided the Person of Christ. With the opponents of this error, "Since their object was to prove that He who discharges the functions of Mediation in His fleshly nature is personally identical with the Eternal Word, nothing was more directly to the purpose than to show how this truth is exhibited in the Holy Eucharist. And therefore the writings of S. Cyril of Alexandria, and of other opponents of Nestorius, bring out the truth, that

the inward part in the Holy Eucharist is not any fresh Body of Christ, but the *very same Body* which He took of the Virgin, and which He offered on the Cross. To quote the words of S. Leo, the final defender of the truth of Our Lord's Person against both its assailants: 'Although He be placed on the Father's Right Hand, yet in *same Flesh* which He took of the Virgin does He carry out the Sacrament of our Propitiation.'" *Wilberforce on the Holy Eucharist, ch. ix.*)

Of the Eutychian heresy Bishop Pearson says ("On the Creed" Art. III.: "Vain therefore was that old conceit of Eutyches, who thought the union to be made so in the natures that the humanity was absorbed and wholly turned into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the human nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this heresy, make use of the Sacramental union between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, and thereby showed, that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the Body and Blood and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine." Bishop Pearson of course, uses the word "substance" in the popular sense.

NOTE XIV.—The doctrine of the Real Objective Presence would seem to be but a complement of the dogma of the Incarnation.

After consecration the elements are physically what they were before, but still are changed into something else. They are no longer common bread and wine but the Body and Blood of Christ "under the form of bread and wine" as the Homilies phrase it.

"Saint Athanasius urged that when the Word became flesh His unchangeable Godhead did not change. He

became flesh without ceasing to be God. He veiled His Godhead under manhood, His Godhead being unchanged. And now He veils both Godhead and manhood under these poor outward forms, the forms of bread and wine. Yet these forms do not therefore cease to be. The Word became flesh, yet was the Word still; so now the lower substance, the earthly part, the bread and wine become, in the language of Saint Ambrose, Saint Chrysostom, Saint Athanasius, Saint Gregory of Nyssa, the Body and Blood of Christ without therefore ceasing to be, as to the outward part, bread and wine still."—*Pusey, The Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers*, p. 239.

And so Pearson, in his work on the Creeds, writes: "As therefore all the *μεταστροφῶν* of the sacramental elements maketh them not cease to be of the same nature which before they were; so the Human Nature of Christ, joined to the Divine loseth not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a substance in itself distinct." *Article III., note 91.*

The following list of books is suggested as most useful for the general reader on the subject of the Holy Eucharist:

Wilberforce on the Holy Eucharist.

Wilberforce on the Incarnation. (These two books should be read together.)

Sadler's Church Doctrine—Bible Truth.

Sadler's One Offering.

Bishop Hamilton on the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Keble's Eucharistical Adoration.

Pusey on the Real Presence.

Pusey's Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers.

Neale and Littledale's Translation of Ancient Liturgies.

Berdmore Conyston's Catholic Sacrifice.

Confirmation.

LECTURE III.

THE VERY REVEREND WILFORD L. ROBBINS, D.D.
Dean of All Saints Cathedral, Albany, N. Y.

CONFIRMATION.

I. THE doctrine of Confirmation is doubtless accounted, by popular estimate, one of the less difficult of the subjects which have to do with the Sacramental system of the Church.

The definition of that doctrine in the authoritative formulas of the Church is meagre. An office for the administration of the rite is provided in the Prayer Book, but this office is not rich in doctrinal suggestiveness. The Twenty-fifth Article refers incidentally to the subject, but in terms which confuse quite as much as they enlighten, and which leave us with what amounts to a mere negation. The Catechism says nothing of Confirmation.

This silence naturally produces on many minds the impression that a subject thus passed over cannot, to say the least, be of prime importance. Meanwhile the ritual connected with the office is of a symbolic type very easily apprehended. It

consists in a solemn benediction of the children of the Church by their chief pastor, accompanied by a prayer that God will strengthen them with gifts of grace for their hard warfare.

Here I fancy the majority of Churchmen rest content. They do not seek to penetrate further into the mystery of the doctrine, perhaps esteem that there is no mystery to penetrate. The popular interpretation based upon this slender doctrinal foundation swings indeed, according to the bent of individual minds, between two rather widely divergent extremes. On the one hand the preface to the office is taken as key-note, and Confirmation becomes little more than a public profession of faith. The act of the child then presented to the Bishop is emphasized, and God has very little to do with the matter save as He must be accounted as accepting this willing proffer of a soldier's service. The Bishop's benediction is construed sentimentally, it is a most becoming symbol of God's gracious favor. On the other hand, the mind imbued with the sacramental character of the Church's life lays greater stress on the Divine aspect of the rite. God does the confirming, not man. Confirmation is a distinct spiritual crisis in life, thenceforward the soul is endued with a fulness of spiritual power which enables it to reach a higher plane of Christain attainment than was possible before.

But even so, the exact nature of the gift bestowed, the relation of Confirmation to baptismal grace, its relative importance in the Christian life, these are questions which are left to answer themselves as best they may.

The moment that one enters upon any serious inquiry, however, he finds that the subject so far from being simple is exceedingly complex, encompassed with peculiar difficulties whether it be approached on the historical, the ritual, or the doctrinal side. By reason of the paucity of reference in Anglican formularies, we are driven for information to Scripture and the testimony of the primitive Church, together with the general consensus of the Church Catholic of later ages. But while the Scripture basis is plain so far as it goes, immediately that the rite emerges as an accepted part of the sacramental system of the early Church in the writings of the Fathers, we find certain ritual additions esteemed essential of which there is no trace in Scripture. We find, moreover, that the language of the Fathers is, on the surface at least, capable of various constructions. Often they seem to attribute to Baptism what in other passages they state in no less decided terms to be the distinctive grace of Confirmation. Moreover, we find that a great change has passed over the use of the Western Church, namely, the deferring of Confirmation to a time

long subsequent to Baptism, which brings to the front a difficult problem which in this form never pressed upon the early Church for solution—the question, What is the spiritual estate of a man baptized but as yet unconfirmed?

And lastly, whatever Confirmation may or may not be, if it be a sacramental rite at all it has to do with *a* gift of the Spirit. And here lies the profoundest difficulty in the way of exact definition of the Confirmation gift. In the course of the doctrinal development of the Church the truths which have to do more especially with the First and Second Persons of the Blessed Trinity have been explicated and defined with a far greater fulness than can be predicated of the doctrine of the Spirit. This is partly due it may be to historic causes, but also in great measure we must attribute it to the inherent difficulty of dogmatic definition in treating of the person and work of the Holy Spirit. He is recognized as pre-eminently in this latter dispensation “the Lord and Giver of life;” He is “with the Father and Son together worshipped and glorified”; He “spake by the prophets.” But though we recognize His agency in all the manifold works of grace which abound within the Church, He is still like “the wind that bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth.” To

draw an analogy from the spirit of man: here lies the very centre of personal existence, this is nearer to us than the breath we breathe, it is ourselves, and yet it eludes definition, its activities transcend explanation. Love, which is the highest exercise of the spirit, the firmest rock amid the shifting sands of human experience, is yet essentially paradoxical in its nature, the spirit losing itself in another, only to find its true self through the willing abandonment of self. The illustration must not, of course, be pressed too far, but it surely should lead us to recognize that we may *know* some things from living experience, which yet refuse to be bodied forth in language strictly amenable to logic.

II. The method which naturally suggests itself in approaching the subject of Confirmation is to begin with those passages of Scripture which seem to bear upon the apostolic institution of the rite.

In Acts viii. we read that, after the death of Stephen, Philip went down to Samaria to preach the Gospel. The preaching bore fruit and many were converted and baptized. "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet He was fallen

upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (vs. 14-18).

Again in Acts xix. we read that S. Paul coming to Ephesus found certain disciples there whose knowledge in the things pertaining to the Gospel was most inadequate; they had not even heard of Christian Baptism, but had received only the baptism of John. S. Paul then having instructed them concerning the faith baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus. "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (v. 6).

One thing at least is evident from these passages. The Pentecostal outpouring was not an isolated event in the history of the Christian Church, a gift bestowed once for all. It was not merely the signal glory of the founding of the Church, but rather the instituting of a ministry of grace henceforth committed to the Apostles. Again in the light of the two above-quoted events we can hardly fail to make application of S. Peter's words (Acts ii. 38), "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," to the laying on of hands. We read: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins,

and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The gift of the Holy Ghost is so explicitly connected with the laying on of hands in the later apostolic practice that the words which might otherwise have seemed to refer to a fruit of the baptismal washing must be regarded as signifying another and distinct gift. And S. Peter straightway adds, "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call"—which precludes the limitation of the gift to apostolic times alone.

But the *locus classicus* which gives fullest assurance that this laying on of hands is a permanent institution of the Church is found in Heb. vi. 1, 2. The writer of the Epistle has been upbraiding the disciples whom he is addressing with their feeble grasp on the fundamental verities of the Christian life. "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat" (v. 12). And then in an enumeration of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ he mentions three groups of such doctrinal foundations—repentance and faith, Baptisms and the laying on of hands, resur-

rection and eternal judgment. It is not necessary to enter here into the somewhat vexed question of the use of the plural "baptisms," which is most probably explained as referring to the baptism of John unto repentance contrasted with Christian Baptism. But the point to be noted is the unhesitating acceptance of the laying on of hands as a permanent institution along with Baptism, among the very primal Christian doctrines. Moreover, the close connection in which it is here placed with Baptism leaves no doubt that the reference is to the rite of Confirmation, rather than to ordinary benedictions or to the laying on of hands in ordination, which latter certainly would hardly thus have been classed with "the first principles of Christ."

We find then clear evidence in Scripture of Confirmation, administered as we may infer only by Apostles, the matter of which consisted in prayer and the laying on of hands, while the inner grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost. That this apostolic laying on of hands was commonly accompanied at the first by the display of miraculous powers on the part of the recipient cannot be taken in the light of S. Paul's teaching as differentiating the gift of the Spirit then and now in any material sense. The higher chrismata remain, though the miraculous evidence of the Spirit's indwelling has been withdrawn.

There is one other passage in the Book of the Acts which brings out even more strongly the distinction between this gift of the Spirit and the grace of Baptism. Although the normal method for the conferring of the gift is by the laying on of hands, God's grace is not tied down to any one channel. I refer to the case of Cornelius recounted in Acts x., where we read that while S. Peter was yet speaking "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word." Then it is that S. Peter exclaims, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (vs. 47, 48). Doubtless there is much which is very mysterious in this account. It is hard for us to understand how those who had not as yet been incorporated into Christ by the Sacrament of Baptism could receive the fulness of the spiritual gift. But incidentally we may surely learn that it is at all times precarious to set a limit to the abounding activity of God's grace; in this, as in most matters theological, we are on safer ground in our affirmations than in our negations. The point, however, which is of special interest to our present inquiry is that the gift of the Spirit did not supersede the need of Baptism. There must then be a distinctive grace attached to each, the one does not swallow

up the other as the greater the less. The order of bestowment may by God's miraculous dispensation be inverted, both are still necessary to the perfection of Christian life.

Bearing these plain statements of apostolic practice in mind, many other passages become clear in which otherwise we should hardly have understood the latent reference. Such, for instance, are S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit," (R. V.)—where the distinction and evident progress marked by the two phrases "baptized in the Spirit" and "made to drink of the Spirit" correspond exactly to the varying movements of grace in the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. Or again in Gal. iv. 6, "And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."—where plainly the Sonship is the fruit of Baptism, while the gift of the Spirit is subsequent to the Sonship and as it were grounded upon the baptismal grace.

When we pass from the testimony of Scripture to that of the Fathers we seem at first to find the clear distinction between the grace conferred in Baptism and in the laying on of hands somewhat obscured. It would be easy to quote nu-

merous passages from S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, S. Jerome, and many others, which appear on the surface at least to identify the giving of the Holy Ghost with the baptismal gift. But one fact already adverted to must be borne in mind which throws an entirely new light on this language. In the early Church, nay down to the thirteenth century, and in England probably later, Confirmation was always administered, as it is to this day in the Eastern Church, either immediately after Baptism or as soon as circumstances might permit. Thus Confirmation was in practice so fused with Baptism, that the two were often referred to as though together they constituted one Sacrament. Not that the distinction was ever really forgotten, but the one was regarded as the complement and completion of the other. There was, so to speak, a rhetorical and a more doctrinally exact use of the word Baptism. In the former, as including Confirmation it could be spoken of as conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost, but in the narrower use of the term it is doubtful if a single passage can be adduced in which any Christian writer of the early centuries attributes the gift of the Spirit in the stricter sense to the Sacrament of regeneration.*

* For the proof of this assertion, worked out with great thoroughness, see Canon Mason's "Relation of Confirmation to Baptism," *passim*.

The Eastern Church, retaining as it does the primitive practice of administering Confirmation to infants immediately after Baptism, seems likewise to have retained the primitive doctrine. Thus the language of Macarius, the Bishop of Vinnitza, in his *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, sets forth the doctrine of the Russian Church on the subject in the clearest language :

“ The principal invisible effect of the Sacrament of Unction (*i. e.* Confirmation) is to communicate to the faithful the Holy Spirit. In Baptism we are only purified of all sin and regenerated by the energizing (*la vertu*) of the Holy Spirit, but we are not yet worthy of receiving this Spirit in us, and of becoming His Temples ; by Unction He is communicated to us with all the gifts of His grace, which are indispensable for the spiritual life.”*

Meanwhile in the Roman Church a tendency is evident, at any rate since the Council of Trent, to confuse the Confirmation and baptismal gifts. Following the lead of S. Thomas Aquinas, the language of the Tridentine Catechism shows a somewhat dubious appreciation of the grace of Confirmation, and we miss the clearness of statement which characterized the earlier theology :

“ The difference which there is in the natural life between generation and growth is the same as that between Baptism, which has the effect of regenerating, and Confirmation, by virtue of which the faithful develop, and attain perfect strength of soul.

* Quoted by Father Puller in his tract, “What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?” p. 35.

Besides inasmuch as a new and distinct kind of Sacrament ought to be appointed when the soul incurs a new difficulty, it can easily be seen that, as we need the grace of Baptism for the formation of the mind by faith, so it is exceedingly profitable that souls should be confirmed by another grace, in order that they may not be deterred from the confession of the true faith by any danger or dread of pains or penalties or death." (Cat. Trid. Sacr. Confirm. § 4.)

The language of the Pontifical of the Roman Church in the administration of Confirmation is still, of course, the unmistakable language of Catholic Christendom, but her popular theology, as well as her conciliar explication of that language, both point to a distinct lapse from the earlier standard.

Whatever vagueness may have attached to this point at the time of the Anglican Reformation, and however we may regret that the primitive doctrine was not more clearly emphasized in the authoritative teaching of our Prayer Book, we have still to be thankful that no phrase has crept into our formularies which contravenes the truth.

In the baptismal office the activity of the Holy Ghost as the agent of regeneration is repeatedly recognized: "Wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost," we pray. Again with fine discrimination the phrase runs, "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation." And after the administration we thank God that

it hath pleased Him to regenerate the infant with His Holy Spirit. But nowhere is the gift of the Holy Ghost in His proper Person, His indwelling in the soul in the plentitude of His grace-giving attributes, implied as a resultant of the Sacrament of regeneration.*

In the Confirmation office itself the lines of the old Sarum use are pretty closely followed. The Confirmation prayer indeed is softened down, and loses in clearness of statement. "Strengthen them, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them Thy manifold gifts of grace," has not the ring of certitude of the old phrase, "Send upon them

* An exception must perhaps be made of one expression in the form of "Ministration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years." In the exhortation we read, "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will favorably receive these present persons, truly repenting, and coming unto Him by faith; that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost; that He will give them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting kingdom." This office was compiled in the Revision of 1662, and the carefully guarded wording of the parallel passages in the Office for Infant Baptism, which connect the gift of the Spirit in Baptism specifically with regeneration, seems in this instance not to have been observed. It remains for us simply to confess that we have here a gross carelessness of doctrinal statement. We are forced to do a slight violence to grammar and interpret the phrase, in the light of the earlier form upon which it is founded, as referring to a bestowal of the Spirit to the end that the gift of eternal life may be received, and a share in God's everlasting kingdom.

the seven-fold Spirit, the Holy Comforter from Heaven." Yet there is nothing in the former which can be reasonably said to evacuate the prayer of its doctrinal significance. And the solemn words of benediction whereby the individual application of the Confirmation prayer is made to each candidate, "Defend, O Lord, this Thy child with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine forever: and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more until he come unto Thy everlasting Kingdom," while it falls short of the parallel prayer in the book of 1549, "Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be Thine forever by the virtue of Thy Holy Cross and Passion. Confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of the Holy Ghost mercifully unto everlasting life," followed by the signing of the candidate on the forehead with the sign of the Cross and benediction in the name of the Trinity, is yet perfectly consistent with a fervent recognition of the bestowal of the Holy Ghost through the laying on of hands.

It must be confessed, however, that there are many influences at work which tend to becloud the primitive doctrine of Confirmation in our Communion. First of all there is the popular misconception which confuses Confirmation with the ratification of baptismal vows. As has been well said, we ought to have been guarded against

this error by the fact that by the public catechising of the children which is ordered plain provision is made for a frequent ratification of the baptismal vow. Every time that a child of the Church responds to the question, "Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe and to do as thy sponsors have promised for thee?" "Yes, verily, and by God's help so I will," he is publicly ratifying and confirming his vows.

The history of this error is interesting. In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. it was ordered that no children should be confirmed until they should be able to recite the answers of the Catechism. The Catechism was printed in this book as a part of the Confirmation office, and the Bishop was to publicly examine the children therein before confirming them. In the rubric preceding the office this order is said to be most convenient to be observed because that thus the children may openly "ratify and confess" the promises made for them in baptism. In the Prayer Book of 1552 the words "ratify and confess" were changed to "ratify and confirm," apparently, as Blunt says, "out of pure love for a synonym." And in our present book, the public catechising at the time of Confirmation having been dispensed with, the old rubric appears in part as the preface or initial address of the service proper. Thus we have, through the original

incorporation of the Catechism with the office, an emphasis laid on a preparatory rite which not unnaturally led to its being regarded as an essential part of the service. And then by a trick of words, confess changed to confirm, an impression is conveyed to the uninstructed that from this confirming of vows arose the very name Confirmation of the Sacrament itself.

It is well to bear in mind that the word Confirmation, in the sense in which it is now applied, is not of primitive antiquity. It is confined to the Western Church, and first appears in the writings of S. Ambrose. By the time of S. Gregory it seems to have become thoroughly established, though not to the exclusion of the apostolic term of "the laying on of hands," "the sealing," and the name most frequently employed in the earlier Fathers, and still used by the Eastern Church, of "Unction" or "the Chrism."

We may well believe also that the language of Article XXV. has had much indirect influence in stultifying a due appreciation of the meaning and benefits of Confirmation. The Article indeed does not forbid the calling Confirmation a Sacrament, but by placing it on so distinctly lower a plane than the "two Sacraments of the Gospel," (a phrase somewhat difficult of interpretation, and at best hardly a happy one as marking the

distinguished dignity of the two greater Sacraments generally necessary for salvation), it does what in it lies to belittle what is plainly a grace-giving ordinance of apostolic appointment, one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.

Names are of secondary importance. Whether we call Confirmation a Sacrament or a sacramental ordinance, makes comparatively little difference in the abstract. But as an historic fact, when the name Sacrament is denied to Confirmation the drift is to shrink from attributing to it so unspeakably glorious a gift as the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost.

Nor can I think that the true escape from the dilemma lies in maintaining that Confirmation should be regarded as an integral part, the mere completion, of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. This line is taken by some punctilious Anglicans who seek thus to compass loyalty to the Articles along with the preservation of the sacramental character of Confirmation. But in this view the disciplinary rule of the Western Church, which separates the two by the interval of years, would be hard indeed to justify. Nor is it consistent with the clear voice of the Church which assures us that by Baptism alone a man may most surely be saved. We are driven to acknowledge that Article XXV., while wholesome in its tone as directed against certain evident abuses, has been of

very doubtful value to the Church in so far as it treats of Confirmation. Moreover, the extremely awkward wording of the Article, which seems to imply that Confirmation falls either under the category of "an estate of life allowed in Scripture" or else of "a corrupt following of the Apostles," yet awaits a perfectly satisfactory explanation. The suggestion has been made that the phrase "a corrupt following of the Apostles" may be intended to cover that perversion of Confirmation which identified the essential matter of the Sacrament with unction rather than with prayer and the laying on of hands. This is perhaps on the whole the best explanation offered, but even this bears the stamp of an enforced ingenuity.

And lastly, the trend of Roman doctrine has had its influence in confusing the mind of the Church concerning the dignity and significance of Confirmation. The popular definition, that it is the Sacrament of growth, misleads all the more effectually because it allows of a deep mystical import being assigned to the Sacrament which satisfies minds that would rebel against any rationalistic interpretation. The phrase itself may be capable of a construction which shall not run counter to the witness of Scripture and Christian antiquity. But it obviously suggests a natural analogy which, if examined critically, is found to

meet very imperfectly the requirements of the case. We cannot do better than quote Canon Mason's comment, although he appears to lay a somewhat undue stress perhaps upon certain implications contained in the name criticised :

"Growth in the natural world is not the result of anything new and adventitious, except what comes in the way of support. The life begun in birth naturally asserts itself in growth, if only it be sustained with proper food. No third movement, distinct from generation on the one hand, and from nutrition on the other, needs to be imparted at a given moment in order to produce growth. And certainly there is no movement known by which the immature life can be made to pass forthwith into maturity, from the weakness of infancy into the strength of accomplished manhood. Such a passage is the slow work of time. The Roman view of Confirmation as a Sacrament of growth does not suit the symbolism of a Sacrament given once and once for all. If Confirmation were a Sacrament given daily or at frequent intervals, beginning with the Baptism of the infant, and ceasing when the infant might be said to have attained its full spiritual stature, then Confirmation might be considered the Sacrament of growth, but not Confirmation as we understand it, administered without repetition, and imprinting upon the soul a character which can never be effaced. The Holy Eucharist is the Sacrament which answers to the nutriment by which the spiritual life is sustained and developed, as Holy Baptism is that which first initiates the life ; and there seems to be no room in the analogy for another Sacrament which is to have the effect of imparting growth, least of all for one imparting a sudden growth from a state of imperfection into one of perfection."

III. Among the practical questions which confront us in our modern use of Confirmation the most insistent is the Western custom of separat-

ing it completely from the Sacrament of Baptism, and postponing it until the baptized child has come to years of discretion. That this is a purely disciplinary matter and lies quite within the power of the Church to determine is evident; it touches directly neither the form nor the doctrine of the Sacrament. An analogy might be found in the custom which prevailed to a large extent in the early Church of postponing Baptism until late in life, in order that the stains contracted by sin might be washed away and the soul new-born just before its departure from this earth to Paradise. We may deprecate this as unwise, and think that we can trace the rise of the custom to an inadequate grasp of the doctrine of the nature and potency of baptismal forgiveness, but the Sacrament of Baptism was not in any way vitiated through its undue postponement. So with the modern postponement of Confirmation, it may be wise or unwise, that is a matter for practical inquiry, but it does not necessarily mark any doctrinal divergence from primitive standards. Whether in its inception the custom is to be traced in part at least, like the illustration above adduced, to an inadequate grasp of doctrine is another question.

In the Anglican Communion there is another change, however, in the administration of Confirmation which seems to touch the matter of the

Sacrament more nearly. The use of Chrism is of remote, if not apostolic, antiquity, and prevails in all other branches of the Catholic Church except our own. It is impossible to assert with positiveness that the anointing with oil was a part of the rite of Confirmation as practised by the Apostles, but both its symbolic significance and its apparently universal use in the times immediately succeeding that of the Apostles would lead us to suppose this to have been the case. Anointing would to the mind of the Jew have been associated with some of the most significant ritual acts of the old dispensation. Not only persons but things were anointed as a symbol of solemn consecration, as Jacob anointed the pillar and Moses the furniture of the Tabernacle. Whether anointing was used in setting apart the prophet to his office is doubtful, but it was always the consecration act for high-priest and king. The ritual of the Chrism rapidly developed in the Church, and there soon came to be various anointings, one before Baptism as well as one after, the latter immediately preceding the laying on of hands. This latter anointing seems generally, in the earliest time, like the laying on of hands, to have been confined to the Bishop, at least the anointing on the forehead with the sign of the cross was reserved to him. We find traces very early, moreover, of the Chrism being regarded

as the essential matter of the Sacrament. And after the middle of the fourth century the laying on of hands as a separate rite seems in the East to have fallen into abeyance, while the priest was allowed to administer the unction with oil which had been consecrated by the Bishop. The laying on of hands in the West held its place longer, though unction would appear even as early as S. Augustine to have been regarded as of equal importance, and quite as truly the channel of Sacramental grace.

While we may regret that so edifying and beautiful a ceremony, and one of such universal acceptance in the Church, has fallen into disuse among us, we are abundantly justified on the ground of Scripture in regarding either prayer or the laying on of hands, or both combined, as the essential matter of the Sacrament. Having these the Sacrament is certainly valid, though there seems no sufficient ground for the omission of the Chrism.

The Anglican Church has received and reaffirmed the Western use of separating Confirmation from Baptism by a space of several years. She has added thereto a special emphasis laid upon the intelligence and faith requisite to the most edifying reception of the Sacrament. Her traditions point to an age-limit rather older than that customary in the Roman Communion.

Since in this she has traversed no Scriptural or Catholic doctrine we are bound in loyalty to yield obedience. But this attitude of the Church lays upon us a very special responsibility. The only possible excuse for deferring Confirmation to the age of twelve or fourteen years is that the recipient may be so spiritually and intellectually prepared that he may the more abundantly bring forth the fruits of the Spirit when the Spirit is given. The preparation of candidates then becomes of paramount importance. It is not the question whether the requisite repentance and faith *could* be exercised by sponsors as in the case of Baptism. Doubtless they could. Primitive practice and that of the Eastern Church to-day bear witness to this. But since the Anglican Church wills that in this Sacrament the individual himself shall repent and believe, and orders that such instruction shall be given as shall enable him to approach this great spiritual crisis with mind and heart alert to the responsibilities involved, in the name of sound reason let the instruction be searching and thorough. If the stories be true which come to us of the customs which prevailed in this regard not so very long ago, there has been a marked awakening within the last forty years. But there is much room for improvement still. It is an awful thought that a child advanced enough in years to have

fallen into habits of sin and to have grown grossly careless of spiritual things should be brought to receive the great gift with no quickened sense of the privileges which lie open to him, and the redoubled heinousness of deliberate rejection. The perfunctory gathering of a class for presentation to the Bishop, the unworthy ambition latent in the desire to receive commendation for the number rather than the character of the candidates, threatens dishonor to the Sacrament, and may mean lamentable disaster to the souls of men.

If one seek for a clearer definition of what is meant by the gift of the Spirit in Confirmation, as distinguished from the energizing of the Spirit in prevenient grace, in the new birth, and the multiform activities of the regenerate life antecedent to Confirmation, we may be driven to confess that amplification beyond the statement of the fact is difficult.

In the New Testament record there is the mark of a spiritual crisis at Pentecost inaugurating a new dispensation. So striking is the contrast between the old order and the new, that the world could even be said to have been without the Spirit before His coming in the Pentecostal outpouring. If the reading of S. John vii. 39, upheld by the best manuscript authorities, is to be received, the Apostle uses a yet more startling

phrase, "for the Spirit was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Yet the world had been full of the activity of the Spirit in prophets and holy men from the dawn of time. Jesus Himself on the night of Easter Day breathed upon His disciples and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained."

Read that wonderful last discourse of Jesus with His disciples on the eve of the Passion, contained in chapters fourteen to eighteen of S. John's Gospel. There you will find the best explication of the blessing bestowed through the personal indwelling of the Spirit as contrasted with the richest and most abundant of His activities exercised upon the soul of man from "without" rather than from "within," if we may adopt the bold figure of speech which some have ventured.

The contrast between the world before and after Pentecost is, of course, only used as an analogy. All Christians live under the blessing of the new dispensation, and the very fruits of the Baptismal grace are the outflow of the Spirit's abiding presence in the world. But the analogy will help us to apprehend how a personal indwelling in the soul may be distinguished from other movements of grace, exercised by the same

Spirit, which bring the soul into close and saving union with God.

And perhaps a word is necessary here in reply to the charge that this magnifying of Confirmation tends to obscure the pre-eminent honor assigned by the Church of all ages to the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. This lecture is not designed to plead a special cause, but merely to put before you very briefly the Scriptural basis and an outline of the history of Confirmation. Holy Baptism which cleanses from sin through incorporation into Christ, and which endows the soul thus regenerate with grace to attain all holiness, must ever remain, with the Blessed Eucharist, the incomparably precious bond of the covenant of grace. But to shrink from the language of Scripture in defining the grace of Confirmation as the gift of the Spirit, because of an implied negation which would leave, in the words of a recent writer, "The majority of adults without this blessed gift," is a simple begging of the question. The more rational course would be to inquire whether the Church has not been guilty of laxity in failing to press Confirmation more strenuously upon all her children as the very perfecting of their Baptism. And there certainly is cause for heart-searching in some quarters where Confirmation has ceased to be regarded as essential, when it

may be had, to a participation in the most sacred mysteries of the Lord's Body and Blood.

In conclusion let us bear in mind that however admirable any analysis of the Spirit's gifts may be in aiding us to apprehend the fulness of the blessing vouchsafed through His indwelling presence—even that old sevenfold division consecrated by immemorial usage in the Church and embedded in the very Confirmation prayer itself—such analysis will hinder rather than help if we fail to lay emphasis on the fact that it is the Holy Ghost Himself, not His attributes or spiritual powers merely, who is given in Confirmation. The ray of sunlight may be broken up into its various constituent colors by the prism for purposes of clearer scientific apprehension; analysis is a useful process if it does not end in itself, but to enjoy the beauty and receive the benefit we must at the last accept the light as God has given it with the hearts of children. And so above all other preparation for the great gift of the Spirit is the eager making ready for a Heavenly guest, the breaking down of every barrier which may hinder His flooding the whole house of the heart with the gracious fulness of His own Divine Presence.

Holy Orders.

LECTURE IV.

THE RT. REV. ALEX. CHAS. GARRETT, D.D., LL.D.

Bishop of Northern Texas.

HOLY ORDERS.

"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

"And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."—John xx. 21-23.

THE interest aroused in favor of Christian unity has brought the question of Holy Orders into fresh prominence. Clear views upon this subject are essential to right thinking upon any possible methods of healing our "unhappy divisions." The essay of the lamented Bishop of Durham, which, from the authority of his great name, has had a vast influence in shaping the thought of the day, and the volume of Bampton Lectures by Dr. Hatch, have both contributed to impress a certain view of the sacred ministry upon the minds of reading men. No one will deny to these writers the praise of rare scholarship and un-

wearied patience in their search for information and collation of authorities. Yet one cannot fail to note how often Lightfoot is compelled to modify his opening statement. He seems to feel that he has said more than the evidence will warrant, that he is likely to be misunderstood if taken literally, and that some apology is necessary for the strength of his language. These are his words:

"The kingdom of Christ, not being a kingdom of this world, is not limited by the restrictions which fetter other societies, political or religious. It is in the fullest sense free, comprehensive, universal. It displays this character, not only in the acceptance of all comers who seek admission, irrespective of race or caste or sex, but also in the instruction and treatment of those who are already its members. It has no sacred days or seasons, no special sanctuaries, because every time and every place are holy. Above all, it has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man forgiven. Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head. To Him immediately he is responsible, from Him directly he obtains pardon and draws strength."—Reprint Whittaker, pp. 1, 2.

As an *ideal* picture nothing could be more beautiful. No one knew better than the distinguished writer that this was only an ideal. For this reason he hastens to correct the evil likely to ensue in a practical world, and proceeds as follows:

"It is most important that we should keep this ideal definitely in view. . . . Yet the broad statement, if allowed to stand alone,

would suggest a false impression. . . . As appointed days and set places are indispensable to her efficiency, so also the Church could not fulfil the purposes for which she exists without rulers and teachers, without a ministry of reconciliation—in short without an order of men who may in some sense be designated a priesthood.”—*Ibid.*, p. 2.

From this it is plain that until the Militant Church become the ideal a “ministry of reconciliation” is essential to its existence. What may be the particular form of this ministry in any age is simply a question of fact to be determined by evidence. In the words of Dr. Hatch, “That for the preservation of which we have to contend is not so much ancient form as historical continuity” (Bampt. Lect., p. 211).

The divine life of the Church, and the historical unity of the present with the past, are thus conceded by those two writers who have been too often quoted against them.

Our Lord is at once the centre and exponent of authority. As a focus He gathers all rays of light and life which have ever been into Himself, and from Him as their centre they flow out again to the world. He is the revealer of the Father, and thus expresses to all creatures whatever they may know of the mysterious spiritual Being who made and now sustains them.

A material universe gives knowledge of material laws, or rather of the sequences which intelli-

gence may observe therein; but spiritual things are spiritually discerned.

1. Our Lord appears as one sent—"As My Father hath sent Me," as one having authority derived, not from the dignity of His person, but from God, the author of His mission—"A Body hast Thou prepared Me; Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God;" to do the works which God had given Him to do, whatever they might be. The point to be observed just here is, that the authority by which those works of teaching, of power, or of mercy are done is an authority derived from the mission He is sent to fulfil, is official rather than personal. While in the manner of its exercise it is impossible to avoid finding the power of His divine personality, the authority itself is the gift of God conferred upon Him in His official capacity as the Mediator of the new covenant. It is in this view that it assumes importance as the pattern of ministerial authority. "As My Father hath sent Me"—with this authority to teach, to serve, to suffer, to forgive, to heal, to send—"so send I you." This gift bestowed on Me is now bestowed on you. "Go ye into all the world, preach, baptize, remit and retain sins, serve, suffer, send others."

Thus the authority is from above, not from below, is not the fruit of personal character but the adding to the person of official rank.

2. But as no one can take this honor unto himself except he be lawfully called and sent, so no one can perform the duties of any office without the special grace pertaining to that office. "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Here is the official empowerment in the gift of special grace as before there had been the express bestowal of mission and authority.

It is not intended to affirm that by this means all natural abilities are surrendered or the want of them supplied; still less that all peculiarities of character are set aside or all deficiencies in moral discernment made good. The individual instrument retains its special qualities of tone while yet the breathing through it is to a sweeter tune. No doubt there may still be

"A rift within the lute,"

a flaw in morals or spiritual faith, which may indeed

"Make all its music mute,"

but even then the unworthy recipient of ministerial grace is nevertheless set apart to the Lord's service, and the validity of his ministerial acts remains though he have lost his harmony with things divine.

In short the authority and the power to exercise it are co-ordinate and arise together out of the original commission.

I. The Church as the Body of Christ has a great office in the economy of grace. She possesses the common life in which all the members share. They live because she lives. Drawing her life from Christ the head, those who inhere in her are one with Him. She perpetuates His presence and dispenses His grace in the world. As the Body of Christ she is an organism not an organization. She may be mutilated but cannot dissolve. The germ planted once for all in the humanity of Christ continues to grow by its own laws. A common error of the present day is found just here. The Church is held to be an organization composed of individuals who associate themselves together for religious purposes, who change their mode of government, principles of belief, and general form as changing conditions of environment may suggest. In the words of Dr. Hatch:

"The history of the organization of Christianity has been in reality the history of successive readjustments of form to altered circumstances."—B. L., 213.

It would be difficult to find in a similar compass a more complete failure to apprehend the essence of the case.

1. How shall man know anything of God? Force is gauged by its effects. We measure gravitation by the work it does. Astronomers weigh the planets, calculate their orbits and velocity of

movement, and thus reach some idea of the power which sustains and drives them. But of that power itself we know nothing save through its manifestation. This manifestation depends upon the work to be done and the capacity of the mind observing. The natural eye can range over the heavens at will, and gather much valuable knowledge of the glowing worlds which shine there. This knowledge is real as far as it goes, but indefinitely defective. The same eye looking through a large telescope finds its field narrowed indeed, but how vast the added multitude of worlds! Nebulæ are resolved into their component stars; complexity in unity is revealed where simplicity alone had been expected; and vast fields of ether utterly unknown to our fathers are laid open before us. The power needed to wield all these suns and systems is seen to be immeasurably greater than was before supposed. The greatness of the work grows upon us with growing knowledge, and we judge of the power doing it accordingly. The argument from design as usually presented has failed because the indefinite has been confounded with the infinite. It will forever remain true that the "heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork," that the "invisible things of Him are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power

and Godhead." But it is also becoming more apparent every day that the measures by which we have estimated these manifestations of Deity are so very defective that our conclusions have been erroneous. We have not been able to estimate them at their proper value; but this can never overthrow the manifestations themselves, however it may make us desire a better interpreter of them.

And if in presence of these facts of the physical universe we feel our insufficiency as readers of their hidden meaning, the case becomes more difficult when we attempt the consideration of the graver problems presented in the sphere of morals. Here will and conscience add their special difficulties to those of the understanding. Feeling and sensibility also demand recognition, and require an explanation both of their origin and destiny. Sin, the most appalling fact of human experience, wrings the cry of misery from the soul, but finds neither exposition of its origin nor remedy for its effects in nature. It is plain that reasoning based on natural phenomena and human experience can carry us but a little way toward the throne of God. True, the structure of the human mind, the laws of thought, the voice of conscience, the power of will—all lead us up to God in "Whom we live, and move, and have our being;" yet we are all painfully conscious of

the limitations of this knowledge and of the inadequacy of our most elevated conceptions. We feel the truth of the words, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27). The need of some other agent than mere nature can supply presses upon us with every advance of knowledge. We "cannot by searching find out the Almighty unto perfection" by any use of natural methods. On the other hand it is equally true that methods of revelation must lie within the plane of human faculties, however far beyond they may point and lead us. We cannot take cold immensity by the hand, nor rest our breaking hearts upon the infinite, nor soothe our fainting souls by the contemplation of force. Would we know that "God is love," it is not in the glowing sunshine nor the silver moonlight that we shall learn it, but in the "face of Jesus Christ."

The Humanity of Christ is the vehicle for the conveyance to humanity at large of that wider knowledge of God for which the race has always longed, but which it has failed to attain by all the efforts of philosophers and men of science.

Christ having ascended and passed through the heavens has left the "Church which is His Body" as His agent and representative upon

earth. Because He lives the Body lives. Each member of the Body shares the common life, and lives because of its inherence in the Body. The unity arises from participation in the life of the organism. The common life is the source of all abilities and powers. Flowing directly from Christ the head, but only through channels divinely appointed for its conveyance, it brings to all the world the revelation of knowledge and love not otherwise to be obtained.

It is thus plainly seen to be the office of the Church to teach; to make known to mankind the supernatural facts of which she is at once the witness and exponent; to foretell the future as she records the past; and to make known from age to age the ever-opening purposes of God. She is the guardian of a definite faith which it is her office in the world both to preserve and proclaim. Having received the "lively oracles" she is their custodian and interpreter. The "faith once for all delivered to the saints" is an ascertainable deposit of truth of which she is the witness and keeper.

But it must be remembered that she is a living Body ever weaving into the present not only the precious things of the past, but assimilating also all new developments. With prevision of the future maturing latent powers for the work to be accomplished later. Adhering always to the

primitive type, but unfolding in each successive age such qualities of special adaptation as the intellectual and moral condition of mankind may demand. Not binding herself in the inelastic bandages of the dead, nor forcing her people into a rigid conformity to some outgrown models, but rather showing to every age the matchless power of her life by her wondrous revelation of hidden truth. There is movement everywhere, for all with which she has to do is living. Alive herself with the imperishable life of her Divine head she enshrines a living faith and preaches a living Gospel. Her creeds are not merely dead symbols of a buried age, but filled with the life of God. Her Sacraments and various ministries of grace are not only memorials of great events in the history of her life, but agencies by which those great events are made to live again until the world's end. She is thus a living teacher meeting the requirements of successive generations by the growing talents with which she is endowed.

2. But man needs far more than to be assured by a voice he can understand that "God is love;" he must be informed also how that fact can help him. He feels separated from God by the insuperable barrier of sin. In his calm moments when conscience is allowed to work without intimidation, he knows himself to be both responsible and guilty. The sense of ill-desert

cannot be removed by any process known to him. The history of religion is little more than the history of human effort to escape from this terrible sense of ill-desert. The sacrifices of appeasement offered on all the altars of the world are the proof of this statement. But the terrible truth remains—"It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Heb. x. 4). How, then, shall they be removed? The Incarnation is the only answer to this question. The Humanity becomes the vehicle of redemption. The High Priest presents the sacrifice of perpetual efficacy. "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ, once for all" (Heb. x. 9, 10).

Here the priestly office of the Church comes plainly into view. The eternal sacrifice must be continually presented. The healing virtue must be applied to every individual and to each succeeding age. Pardon, pity, love, must be ministered without ceasing until time shall be no more. It is the office of the Church, as the Body of Christ, to extend the benefits of the Incarnation to succeeding generations. For this purpose she is furnished with sacramental media for the conveyance of life and blessing; by the Sacrament of Baptism imparting the gift of regenerating grace, by the Sacrament of the Altar effecting its

renewal from day to day. The Spirit-bearing Body keeps in circulation the currents of life flowing always from the head to the members. As a whole she perpetuates the redeeming work of Christ, not by repeating it, but by applying its manifold agencies of help to those in need. "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more." He now appears as our great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary to plead there the efficacy of His sacrifice, where "He ever liveth to make intercession for us," while the Church, representing Him on earth, offers continually the memorial of that "sacrifice," applies to the souls of men the efficacy of that "intercession," by remitting the sins of penitents, lifting up the fallen, restoring the lost, and comforting those that mourn. With human sympathies, through human means of grace she keeps in touch with human needs, takes into herself our griefs and pains, and heals the gaping wounds which sin has made by the ministration of Divine remedies. This Divine organism preserves the Divine life of the Son of Man in this lower world for the healing of mankind. Incorporated into this Body we are incorporated into Him who is the head of the Body, and thus obtain the benefit of all Christ's redemptive work. "Buried with Him by baptism" we are with Him also "raised" into "newness of life," and "made to sit together

in heavenly places." The Church is thus seen to be the mediating agent through whom all priestly benefits obtained by the "one Mediator between God and men" are made available for the relief of human needs.

3. But wide as is the area over which the philosophy of religion aided by the light of Revelation carries the mind, and deep and profound as are the issues of life affected by the priestly work of the eternal sacrifice, it must not be forgotten that both of these are but preliminary steps to the high prerogatives of royalty, to a share in which the King of Kings invites those who are to be "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." It is impossible to overestimate the sublimity and importance of the words of Christ as recorded in the closing lines of St. Matthew's Gospel:

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 18–20.

This high prerogative of royal power for the government of all nations is the most majestic claim ever pronounced by human lips. Nothing short of the Divine right to its exercise as the Mediatorial King could possibly justify such language. Lips merely human would have withered

in the utterance. Government is doubtless the greatest work of God. Building a whole universe of worlds and flashing them into space to wheel in measured order obedient to the laws of motion and gravitation has not been found as difficult in fact as the guiding of free intelligence in a single pair created with the dread possession of liberty. The principles which govern dead material things or shape new forms of chemical combination, or develop new results in the flora and fauna of succeeding ages, will be found of little force in directing the human will to choose the more remote good of righteous action rather than the gratification of present pleasure. The stern discipline of conscience sustained by repeated intimations of the penalty inseparable from moral delinquency will be found in fact all too weak to restrain the soul from following the line of least resistance in pursuit of present enjoyment, though well assured both of the guilt and sorrow which must inevitably ensue.

The government of free moral beings, who, from the complexity of their nature, are capable of good and evil, is therefore a much higher science than marshalling the suns and systems of the visible heavens.

To bring such beings to a condition of stable equilibrium in the full enjoyment of liberty in accordance with the eternal law of righteousness

is the purpose for which the Mediatorial Kingdom has been established. "A sceptre of righteousness" is the sceptre of this King. To teach mankind the principles of righteousness, to bestow upon mankind such gifts of grace as may secure the triumph of such principles, and to raise mankind to the power and glory which are the imperishable birthright of those who reign in righteousness, is the sublime object for which the "Word was made Flesh"—for which "He endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb. xii. 2).

Here again, the office of the Church as the "Body of Christ" becomes conspicuously apparent. Her very purpose in the world is both to teach and empower men to govern themselves by the law of righteousness. Engrafted into her by Baptism men are "brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" are taught in all sacred learning; trained in all holy ways; and "made kings and priests unto our God." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is" (1 John iii. 2). The words of S. Peter seem to glow with the radiance of the eternal day: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar

people" (1 Pet. ii. 9). These are the high prerogatives of the "Body" in its organic unity. The peculiar honors of the Divine Head are also the honors of those who share His life and love. The Kingdom of God among men extends by the agency of men. But the principle of government descends from above and is distributed from the Head to the members. The living Church holds the power as a delegation from above, not as an evolution from below. The Divine Humanity is the channel for its conveyance through such media as have been Divinely appointed for the purpose. The practical dominion of righteousness over the nations of the earth is slowly effected as the Church brings the power of redeeming love to bear upon the national conscience in each succeeding age. This she accomplishes by Christian education, organized charities, benevolent associations, and the multiplied agencies she has been commissioned to employ for sanctifying the civilization of the world. The government of her King—the government of truth and righteousness—it is her high mission to establish in the hearts of all her members until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ."

Thus the threefold office of the Church as the Spirit-bearing Body of Christ for the salvation of mankind stands out boldly before us. The pillar

and ground of the truth, the treasury of pardon and healing grace, and the kingdom of righteousness, she represents Christ in the world, "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 13).

II. The Ministry is the organ for the performance of these corporate functions.

I. As in the body of a man there are many members, all sharing the common life, yet all have not the same office, so also is the Church. The eye, the ear, and other organs of the body live because the body lives, die when the body dies, yet they do not derive their special designation as organs from the common life but from the original Source of all life, who hath fashioned them according to the counsel of His own will. Should the eye be born blind the body is wholly blind, nor can all the life of the body, though vigorous in every other organ, give sensibility to the eye. The organ of sight is necessary to vision. Destroy it by accident or disease and the power of vision is destroyed with it.

Our Lord "glorified not Himself to be made an high priest," but was "called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4, 5). He, in turn, "ordained twelve that they should be with Him, whom He called Apostles," and "appointed other seventy

also that they should go into every city and place whither He Himself would come;" and later, He more specifically commissioned and appointed those whom He had called and chosen that they should "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost having descended and fully empowered those before appointed, they began to execute the high functions to which they had been appointed. Here the infant organism is seen in its first attempts at organic development.

(a) Its life is a *derived* life, flowing directly from Heaven through the "power from on high" which had been promised. It flows through veins and arteries prepared beforehand to receive it. It finds organs divinely constituted to preserve and perpetuate it in the world. It does not create, develop, or evolve the ministerial organ—that has been already ordained by external power and authority, and is waiting expectant for the fulfilment of the promise.

(b) The life of the "Body" is *our* life. The Apostles on the morning of that memorable day, and the "three thousand" baptized converts who were "added unto them" before the setting of the sun, all shared the same life, all felt the throb of a common pulse, all lived because Christ lived and they had been incorporated into Him. This

life is not the aggregate of the individuals who on that morning or evening constituted the "Body;" it is the life of the Body as such whether the individuals incorporated be many or few. The life is not diminished though many be cut off, nor increased though a "multitude which no man can number" stand before the throne. The members live because they inhere in the Body, the Body lives because it is the Body of Christ.

(c) Every organ of the Body is also a member of Christ, but every member is not an organ. No one can be ordained to any holy function who has not first been made a partaker of the life of Christ by Holy Baptism. But participation in the grace of sanctification does not involve participation in the grace of Orders. Every nerve and muscle shares the common life, but this does not constitute the one the organ of vision nor assign to the other the duty to smooth or contract the brow. The Church is an organic whole which grows according to its own laws which were impressed upon its germinal cell as first planted in the world by the Lord Himself. The members cannot change this original constitution any more than the hand can say to the head, I have no need of thee. The constitution is of the very life of the organism. To change it would be to change the organism itself, and set

up some new thing in the world quite other than that of which our Lord is the Head and Life.

It has now become fashionable to dwell upon the priestly and royal powers of the Body as a whole, as though these could enable us to dispense altogether with the sacred ministry as composed of a body of men chosen out of the aggregate of members and set apart to their holy functions by Apostolic commission and authority. As well affirm that the diffused sensibility of the nervous system will enable us to see without eyes or hear without ears.

III. As a matter of simple historical fact the Church has never existed without a ministry of Divine appointment.

As we have already seen, our Lord Himself was "called of God," and also definitely set apart by the Holy Ghost for the work of His very awful ministry, declared to be the Son of God with power by His resurrection from the dead, and proclaimed by the Divine Voice as the "Beloved Son," glorified in the past and to be glorified again in the near future.

He having been thus solemnly ordained, consecrated, and sent, with similar solemnity selects, calls, ordains, and sends His apostles with definite mission and authority and official empowerment to send others as He had sent them, to preach, baptize, remit and retain sins; and, in a word, to

act as the Divinely constituted organs of His Humanity for the founding and perpetuation of His Kingdom "even to the end of the world."

The germ thus planted soon begins to grow, and as it grows unfolds its hidden powers according to the law of its being. The law is impressed upon it at the outset and is inherent in its original constitution.

How shall we ascertain the constitution of a grain of wheat? By careful observation of its method of growth—"first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." It would be childish and absurd to look for this last first. Nor is the result produced by environment or the conditions in which the grain is placed. If the conditions be unfavorable the plant may die or grow only with a sickly and fruitless life; but if it live and grow at all it must follow the original law of its being; and the successive appearance of each part in its season and time is absolute proof of the original law, and illustrates its nature. Now the method of evolution of the sacred ministry has been traced so often by men of the greatest learning that it must be quite unnecessary to repeat it here.

The ordination by apostolic laying on of hands of the seven Deacons after their popular election; the ordaining at a later period, also by apostolic imposition of hands, of elders or Presbyters in

every city, are positive proof of the nature of the law by which the growth and fruitfulness of the Church were governed. It is the law of development through the agency of human instruments contained in the Divine commission, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." And when the Apostles make provision for the continuance of their office by the appointment and ordination, by imposition of apostolic hands, of men to represent them and who were to "commit" to others the sacred authority thus intrusted to them, a farther proof is given of the true nature of the original law for the propagation of the Church in the world. Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, and many others are conspicuous cases in point. Now to affirm that this method of growth was the result of an effort to copy the synagogue among Jewish converts, and the assemblies common among the heathen by Gentile converts (as Lightfoot and Hatch do everywhere), is equivalent to the affirmation that organisms grow by imitation rather than assimilation. The wheat draws into itself the substances necessary to its growth, and by assimilation converts them into silicate, gluten, starch, and whatever else its life law enables it to produce; but it does not copy or merely absorb by imitation what it finds. The calla lily and the rose growing side by side draw their nourishment from the same air and

sun and soil, but each follows the law of its own life in the use it makes of it—a law not derived from its environment but inherent in itself.

Whatever men may have found useful in any age for the government of assemblies or religious societies the Church may or may not have adopted, because human nature is very much the same in every age and country; but the thing thus adopted is speedily changed in quality and use, having a new life imparted to it by which its nature and work are elevated and spiritualized. The same thing is illustrated in the literature which Christianity has inspired. Such words as “grace,” “faith,” “virtue,” “humility,” “love,” existed in human speech before Christ was born. Our Lord found them ready for His purpose, poured into them the power of His own life, reproduced them full of a heavenly sound and sweetness before unknown; and they live to-day as the sufficient evidence of the source and quality of the life which they have been consecrated to express.

The names most familiar to us by which we designate those ordained to any holy function were in use before Christianity adopted them; but the question is, not whether they existed in human use, but whether they have been adopted by Divine appointment; not whether they have been copied, but whether they have been conse-

crated to specific uses in the Body of Christ. On this point there cannot be any room for controversy if only men are willing to be governed by Holy Scripture and history.

(a) The Deacons were originally appointed to minister in alms and charities under the direction of their superiors, to preach upon occasion, and baptize those converted. There their powers ended. S. Stephen, the first martyr, is the chief illustration of the preaching Deacon, and S. Philip appears in the wider range, both preaching and baptizing. Though his ministry was accompanied by special wonders and mighty works, yet his ministerial powers were limited. "When the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John," to whom the higher function of "laying on of hands" belonged. The limitation of the power of Deacons, thus plainly shown even in the case of those otherwise specially endowed, has never been seriously called in question.

(b) As the Apostles travelled about preaching the Gospel and making converts, they ordained Presbyters in every city, intrusting to them the higher authority, not only to preach and baptize as the Deacons could, but to minister also in the more awful responsibility of the remission of sins and the spiritual feeding of the people in the

Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. Subject to the order of the Apostles who had ordained them, they governed the infant churches with such delegated powers as they were authorized to use. Here, then, were three distinct orders in the sacred ministry. As there had been the High Priest, Priests, and Levites among the Jews, so here, first our Lord, the twelve, and the seventy, then, after the Ascension, Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons. The trinity of sacred offices has so far been preserved. Was it departed from later and a new thing under the sun of two orders introduced? Let him produce the proof who can, for it is still "evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" (Preface to the Ordinal). Some, indeed, being anxious to escape from this conclusion, have been bold enough to affirm that the Apostles dying left no successors, and that therefore the threefold cord was broken and the ministry in two orders alone survived; that the Presbyters, thus left without a head, fell to quarrelling among themselves, and were compelled to choose one to preside, and so maintain order. This position was advanced at the time of the Reformation, and has lately been reproduced with all the weight which the Bampton lecturer, Dr.

Hatch, and the far greater Dr. Lightfoot, could give it. Here I must quote the words of the now far-famed S. Jerome, which have attained much wider range than that somewhat sour foe of Bishops ever dreamed of. The passage is found in the commentary on the Epistle to Titus, chapter i.

"Before there were factions in religion, and the people began to say, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by the common advice of the Presbyters. But when every man thought those whom he had baptized to be his own, and not Christ's, it was decreed in the whole world that one chosen out of the Presbyters should be set above the rest, to whom all the care of the Church should appertain, and the seeds of division rooted out." The "decree," aforesaid, has never been produced, but let that pass. S. Jerome then proceeds to show how the words "Bishop" and "Presbyter" were used interchangeably in these early days, and builds his argument for their identity upon the familiar passages in which they occur together (*cf.* Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28), and concludes: "These things I bring to show that anciently Presbyters were all one with Bishops; and that in tract of time, to pluck up the roots of dissension, all the charge of the Church was committed to one" (*Ibid.*).

The question of real moment here is, at what

time this radical change was made, and by what authority? If the purpose of it were to stop the growth of schisms it was not long before it was called for. Schisms and divisions grew even in the Apostles' times, as appears from the Epistles of S. Paul. Wherefore these words of S. Jerome, interpret them as we may, do not affirm that Presbyters ruled the Church after the Apostles' time. Whatever powers they exercised were held subject to apostolic direction.

Now, since the Apostles in natural course could not live always, the necessity was plain that they should commit to others such powers as were necessary for the perpetual government of Christ's Church. These powers may be summarized briefly, as the power to preach the word and minister the Sacraments, the right use of the keys, and the imposition of hands for the continuance of the ministry in the world.

To quote the words of Bishop Bilson ("The Perpetual Government of Christ Church"):

"The Apostles, both in teaching and governing the churches, when they were present had helpers; when they were absent had substitutes; after their final departures or deaths left successors."—Bilson, p. 277. Again on the next page: "It may not be denied but as the word and sacraments are the most essential seeds of the Church, so the handling and sowing thereof in the Lord's ground must be the general and principal charge of all pastors and presbyters that either feed or rule the flock of Christ. . . . Wherefore in preaching the word and ministering the sacra-

ments, the scriptures know no difference betwixt pastors and teachers, bishops and presbyters."

(c) The powers of discipline and government must also remain forever in the Church. The question now is to whom these powers were committed, whether equally to Bishops and Presbyters or to Bishops only.

The power of discipline was committed to the Apostles in the memorable words spoken to S. Peter: "I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19). And on another occasion is extended to all the Apostles: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx. 22, 23). This power was held and exercised by the Apostles after our Lord's Ascension. It was never intrusted to the Presbyters, but was always used, as most conspicuously at Corinth, under the direction of the Apostles. In due time this specific power of discipline was given to Timothy, Titus, and others by apostolic appointment, and with definite directions as to the place and sphere of its exercise. Another mark by which Bishops were distinguished from Presbyters in the Apostles' time is singularity. Presbyters were many,

Bishops one in a city over the many Presbyters.
To quote Bishop Bilson again :

“ This singularity of one pastor in each place descended from the Apostles and their scholars in all the famous churches of the world by a perpetual chain of succession, and doth to this day continue, but where abomination or desolation, I mean heresy or violence, interrupt it. Of this there is so perfect record in all the stories and fathers of the Church, that I much muse with what face men that have any taste of learning can deny the vocation of Bishops came from the Apostles. For if their succession be apostolic, their function cannot choose but be likewise apostolic ; and that they succeeded the Apostles and Evangelists in their churches and chairs may inevitably be proved, if any Christian persons or churches deserve to be credited.”—pp. 319, 320.

It is unnecessary to point out the illustrious example of S. James as the first Bishop of Jerusalem and president of the first council, of which the record is preserved in Acts xv.; of S. Timothy, who was placed over the Church at Ephesus with specific superiority over all other officers; of S. Titus, who was similarly appointed to Crete with a definite authority over all he found there.

The third distinctive mark by which the Bishop was separated from Presbyters, even in the Apostles' days, is the power of ordination.

Those recent writers before referred to who have made so much use of S. Jerome seem to have forgotten how the saint when writing to Evagrius corrects the over-strong statement al-

ready quoted from his commentary on Titus. Like Bishop Lightfoot he expressed himself in terms which he found it necessary to modify. He is indeed anxious to impress upon his correspondent how much he thinks of Presbyters, to which order he himself belonged, and how little of Bishops, to whose rank he had not attained. These are his words: "What doth a Bishop, save ordination, which a Presbyter may not do?" (Ad Evag. cii.). Now those words of Jerome—*excepta ordinatione*—are sufficient to end the whole controversy with those who take him for their oracle. Here it is conceded by this mighty champion, that in whatever other respects he and his order had no superiors, they had in this—they could not ordain Presbyters and Deacons; and therefore the Church must die with them if there had been no Bishops with apostolic authority to send others as they had been themselves sent.

It would be tedious to cite again the cases of Ss. Timothy and Titus, to whom this special charge and power were given—to "ordain Elders in every city," and to "set in order the things that are wanting." It would also weary were we to produce again the countless passages which have been collated from the fathers to illustrate this same fundamental verity of the order and polity of the Church.

The Historic Episcopate may be conceded to

be a "growth" without drawing with it any of the consequences which recent writers have endeavored to deduce. As a matter of simple historical fact the Church has never existed without the three Orders since our Lord imparted His Divine Life to it, and defined the law of its growth and development in the world—which law revealed its nature when the Apostles began to exercise their functions after the Day of Pentecost.

1. There always have been those to whom the elementary and preparatory work has been given, in whom tenderness and sympathy, as shown in the ministries of charity, were particularly required, and whose duty it was to report to those who had sent them the condition of the work they had in hand.

2. There have always been those to whom higher functions were assigned, who were admitted to closer relation with our Lord, to whom profounder mysteries were intrusted in offering the memorial sacrifice and proclaiming with authority the remission of sins; whose "lips should keep knowledge" that they might be able to "instruct the ignorant and them that are out of the way;" whose should be the spiritual eye to see the Heavenly vision, the spiritual ear to hear the Word of the Lord, and the spiritual tongue to "preach the Gospel to the poor and to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

3. There have always been in the Church, by whatever name distinguished, those who possessed all the powers of the two orders just enumerated but to whom was also given by express Divine appointment other exclusive powers, never at any time possessed by the Presbyters and Deacons, and therefore quite impossible to be derived from them—powers the most important of which were the “keys,” for the ultimate discipline of offenders, and “imposition of hands” for the ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons for the propagation of the Church in the world until time shall be no more.

By these “the whole Body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of itself in love” (Eph. iv. 16).

4. The Ministry being the Divinely commissioned organ of the Body for the performance of the functions of the Body has its own functions thereby defined.

(1) The Church Militant must ever continue a *teaching* Church. Her prophetic office cannot become obsolete until her Lord return in power and great glory. The message to every succeeding age is her message; the “hope of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus” is her hope; the

"love" of "His appearing" is her love. To make mankind know and feel these mighty powers of the world to come is her great business in the world. It is the solemn duty and lofty privilege of every member of the Body in "his vocation and ministry," both to illustrate in his own life and impress upon others by precept and example, these facts of the Church's life and faith and hope. On this it is not possible to lay too much stress. Here indeed is a wide sphere of usefulness where the Laity may do most excellent work, and exercise a power for good quite beyond the reach of the clergy. Nevertheless the Church has a teaching "organ," an inspired tongue, distinctively commissioned and appointed to "teach all nations," to "publish the glad tidings of good things," to "preach the Gospel to every creature." This order of men is set apart to give themselves wholly to the "ministry of the Word," to bend all their powers that way, to qualify themselves by prayer and study of Divine things to receive and convey to others the message they have been authorized to deliver. I say "authorized to deliver" advisedly, because the ministers of the Word are "heralds" and "ambassadors" to proclaim terms of pardon and reconciliation, to announce coming penalties which are surely to overtake the disobedient, and glorious blessings which await those who shall be found "meet for

the inheritance of the saints in light." This is a matter of authority and official empowerment. There are many of the Laity possessing gifts of knowledge and sanctification at whose feet the clergy would gladly sit and learn in all humility, but the word of a "prophet" and "ambassador" is not dependent upon his personal merits but upon his official appointment. He represents Christ, as the organ of the Body specifically designated for the purpose, and can neither devolve upon another, nor suffer another to assume (without due official empowerment in regular order), the functions he has been ordained to discharge.

Of course we are not ignorant of the difficulties (for others) involved in this view. But the question is not, What complications have resulted in the lapse of time from the passions and prejudices of men? but, What is the function of the sacred ministry by Divine appointment? Here also it is not our purpose to inquire what powers of compensation the Body itself may have whereby organic deficiency in any part may not indeed be supplied, but in some sense dispensed with by increased vitality elsewhere. A nice question, ably handled by many writers of note, but lying outside the compass of this lecture.

(2) It is difficult to understand what Lightfoot and Hatch hope to gain by dwelling upon the

hieratical quality of the priesthood of the Laity, but denying any similar significance to that of the clergy. Whatever quality of priesthood belongs to the Body as a whole cannot possibly be taken away from those who are the organs of the Body for the performance of its priestly functions. Whatever power of vision the body has cannot surely be taken away from the eye, which is the organ of vision. Certainly the eye cannot see unless it inhere in a body with nerve ganglia sensitive to light. And, doubtless, there could be no clerical priesthood unless there were a Body with priestly functions to be performed, of which the ministry is the priestly organ.

But what is the quality in sacrifice which gives it value? Is it the pain and nervous horror of the quivering victim? Is it the crimson gore poured out at the foot of the altar? These things are valueless as purchase-money before the throne of God. Their value lay in their spiritual significance. They pointed away from themselves to the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." They were symbols and shadows to raise the soul of the ignorant worshipper to the contemplation of heavenly things.

And when we stand, reverently with bowed heads, before the tragedy of the Cross, wherein lies its efficacy? Is it in the torn muscles and lacerated nerves, the drops from the sacred Head

responsive to the cruel thorns, the tide of "blood and water" flowing from the spear thrust? Only in a very secondary sense. It is the "blood of God," as the Apostle has expressed it in the Acts, with which He hath "purchased" the "Church of God." The eternal sacrifice is a spiritual reality consummated before the foundation of the world, but "manifested" on the plane of time and history for the revelation of God and the recovery of fallen man. The Church is the perpetual witness of this sublime revelation, and she is to present continually a "memorial of the sacrifice of the death of Christ until His coming again." Surely the power and glory of the priesthood are not found in the right and ability to use the sacrificial knife, but in the official authority to communicate to mankind the spiritual gifts of life and power once for all procured by the Great High Priest, and to be by them preserved and conveyed to the perishing race, "until the end of the world." Christ Himself, both Priest and Victim, hath delegated by authority to those whom He hath commissioned, the distinctive and specified function of remitting and retaining sins as the Divinely constituted organs of His Humanity for that purpose. He hath also plainly set forth and designated the sacramental media by the continued use of which the grace of life, pardon, and spiritual nourishment is to be ob-

tained through the official ministration of the organs He hath ordained. Whatever other high and awful priestly powers He may still hold in His own hands, these at least He has delegated to those who represent Him here. The priesthood of His Presbyters is, therefore, His priesthood to offer such sacrifices as He hath appointed. Very awful indeed is the responsibility laid upon those who are commissioned to serve in the sacred ministry of the Church. Let them beware how they listen to voices in the air, lest they forget the dread solemnity of the office and administration to which they have been called.

(3.) The statement of Dr. Hatch, that "Christianity became more democratical" as time went on, is another evidence of the strange way in which some minds fail to catch the essence of the question.

If our Lord was merely the result of human development, evolved by natural process out of the Jewish life of His age, then, of course, His religion would also be merely of human origin, and would naturally change with the changing times according to the fashion of this world. To affirm this is to beg the whole question. If the supernatural facts lying at the base of Christianity be not historically true, it is mere waste of time to endeavor to construct a system of doctrine and polity to suit them. What is to be

gained by deceiving ourselves? Christianity is either supernatural or it is not. If not, our Scriptures, creeds, and history are all worthless, for they affirm it to be supernatural. But if it be in truth supernatural, what is gained by trying to eliminate the supernatural from its life and growth?

Christ is not elected a King by popular vote. When "they would take Him by force to make Him a King, He withdrew Himself from them." When challenged with the question, "Art Thou a King?" He acknowledged His royal dignity. His Kingdom is not of this world, and is not established in the world by such means as the changing policy of the shifting ages may approve. He has issued His royal edicts, appointed the polity of His government, and designated officers for the execution of His laws. The constitution of His Kingdom is Divine, has been handed down from Heaven by the loving hand of His own Humanity, has been intrusted to the care of His Church with duly commissioned organs for its preservation and propagation in the world.

To say that this has changed, or is changing, or can be changed, is to be guilty of high treason against Him who is "the same yesterday and today, and forever." All powers, gifts, governments whatsoever in the Church of Christ are from above, and can never under any circum-

stances be derived from the people on whom they are conferred by external commission and descent from Christ Himself.

Holy Orders, we conclude, are of Divine and perpetual authority in the Church, which, as the Body of Christ, is to convey to all ages the blessings of His Incarnation. The sacred ministry is the Divinely appointed organ for communicating to mankind the life and graces flowing from Christ to His Body, the Church.

The ministry is constituted in three Orders, commonly designated as Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

These all derive their special designation as "organs" of the "Body" by external commission and descent from the Apostles. The functions of the three orders are plainly defined in Holy Scripture and ancient authors, and may be summarized as follows:

Bishops are distinguished by the power of imposition of hands for ordaining successors, and conveyance of special grace; by the authority of government and discipline as well of clergy as of laity.

Presbyters are ordained to be ministers of the Word and Sacraments, to remit and retain sins in such sort as the Lord hath commanded, to offer the memorial of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and thus to "show forth the Lord's death until He come."

Deacons are ordained to minister to the poor, preach if they be thereto licensed, wait upon those who serve the altar, and thus to purchase to themselves a "good degree" in due season.

By the harmonious operation of the three orders in the faithful discharge of all holy functions the Church and Kingdom of God have been appointed to grow in the world "until the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea."



Unction, **M**atrimony, and **P**enance.

LECTURE V.

RIGHT REV. CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D.,
Bishop of Fond du Lac.

UNCTION, MATRIMONY, AND PENANCE.

"I speak concerning Christ and the church."—Eph. v. 32.

"Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church."—S. James v. 14.

"For behold this self-same thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge!"—2 Cor. vii. 11.

THREE subjects have been assigned for this discourse: Marriage, Unction, and Penance. They seemingly stand apart. The light and joy of the marriage feast with its garlands and sweet odors, and music, and dancing feet, and blossoms of hope. The darkened room, the whispered silence, the mystery of pain, the sufferings of the body in sympathy with its partner soul, the stealthy step of death. The tribunal of Penance, where mercy and justice clasp their hands; where God's paternal love strives with His erring child; from whence the devils, baffled, flee away in rage;

whose deepened sorrow issues in holy vengeance against sin; whose falling tears become "the wine of angels," or turn to jewels in Christ's crown.

Different in outward garb, one bond unites them all, and that is, grace. There is the grace of Matrimony, the grace of Unction, the grace of Penance. May the Holy Spirit enlighten us with the mind of Christ, fill us with His wisdom, and so lift us up together into the Divine light, that we may love that which He reveals and by obedience be conformed to it.

I.

First, let us consider the subject of Unction. The reason of its use lies hidden in the person of Christ. Jesus is the Christ, the Anointed. So He declared Himself to be, at the opening of His ministry, in the synagogue at Nazareth.

"And He came to Nazareth . . . and . . . went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. . . . And when He had opened the book, He found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath *anointed* Me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set

at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the Lord." *

As the Son of Man, He is anointed with the Holy Ghost to be the world's Supreme Prophet, who is to proclaim the year of jubilee, and to be in Himself "the beginning of the new creation of God." He comes to gather men into union with His own transforming nature, that He may lift them up into God. He goes out upon His work and all nature acknowledges its new Master. The waves uphold Him. The heavens open over Him. The earth cannot retain Him. Disease flees before Him. The devils crying out acknowledge Him. The angels minister to Him. At His word death yields up its prey.

He has jurisdiction over all things, spiritual and material. "They brought to Him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed, and . . . Jesus said . . . Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." And when they questioned, and thought evil in their hearts, He replied, "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, then saith He to the sick of the palsy, Arise, take up thy bed and go unto thine house." †

In the exercise of His anointing power He gives light to the souls and healing to the bodies

* S. Luke iv. 18.

† S. Matt. ix. 4-6.

of men. As Elijah stretched himself upon the child, his face to the child's face, his hands to the child's hands, so does Christ bring His Body in contact with our bodies and His Soul in contact with our souls, that our bodies may be made whole by His Body and our souls engrafted by the embrace of His. Our nature is a plural unit; and as such Christ so addressed it, and the restoration of the body declared that the healing gift of grace had touched the soul.

Ofttimes, together with His spoken word He used some significant action, appealing to the blind man's sense of touch or the deaf man's use of sight. Here He stretches forth His hand to heal, here makes an ointment of the clay and spittle and anoints the blind man's eyes.

This, then, is our first thought—that the Man Christ Jesus was anointed to be the light of the world, to be as such the world's Good Samaritan, and the enlightener and healer both of the bodies and souls of men.

Further observe this, that Christ ordained that the grace and power of His anointing were to continue to all generations.

This gift was not bestowed by Him on the Church at large and then delegated by the Church to its ministers. It was given first by Christ to the Apostles. The anointing flowed down first to Aaron's beard. It flowed, in other

words, from Christ, the Anointed Head, to the priesthood. From thence it descended to the whole body. It flowed down to the very skirts of the mystical garment of the Church.

Let us recall how this began. In the preparatory and disciplinary period of their Apostleship, Christ gathers the twelve out from the whole body of disciples into union with His own prophetic ministry and sends them forth to teach.

They were at first limited in their mission to Israel. It is important to note the limits of their jurisdiction. They were given jurisdiction over "all devils."* This is the way their gospel power began. Next, their ministerial power in frustrating the ravages of sin extended to the cure of disease. Further they were authorized to preach the coming in of the Kingdom of God,† and that men should repent. This was their message—such was their authority. And they went out and preached repentance, and Satan's power was shaken. "They cast out devils," and they delivered penitents from bodily evils. "They anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them."‡

It is immaterial whether they carried the oil with them or found it on their journey. It is sufficient that they used it as they did, with the

* S. Luke ix. 1.

† S. Luke ix. 2; S. Matt. x. 7.

‡ S. Mark vi. 13.

Master's sanction. Christ herein, according to His wont, blessed a recognized remedial agent to symbolize and communicate His gift. It is but trifling to suppose that the Apostles adopted the unction without the Master's direction and solely for the healing properties the oil was supposed to possess. Their common action shows it to have been done in obedience to a command. And its obvious symbolical meaning was to bear witness to Christ the Anointed in whose name they wrought. "The Apostles used it," says Wordsworth, "to show by the application of an appropriate, visible sign, that the healing was effected, by their instrumentality, in the Name of Christ, the Messiah or Anointed One of God, and in His power who had sent them."

And when, after Pentecost, God the Holy Ghost, by His permanent indwelling united the Apostles to Christ; and, guiding them into all truth, revealed Christ's mind to them, then did God the Holy Ghost declare through them how this anointing for the weal of soul and body of Christian men should ever be continued in the Church. "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms. Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." *

* S. James v. 14.

And for what purpose were they to do this? Why were the elders, or priests, to be summoned?

In order intelligently to answer these questions we must first clearly discriminate between those special gifts which our Lord bestowed upon His Church, and the powers which belong to the orders of the ministry.

Our Lord, speaking to the eleven, said that certain signs should follow them that *believe*. "They should speak with new tongues, they should take up serpents; and if they drank any deadly thing it should not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." *

We know these signs, as Christ foretold, followed upon prayers and acts of faith, but they are unconnected with the grace of order. Clergy and laity alike exercise these special gifts of prophecy, and inspiration, and speaking with tongues, and miracles and healings.

And here, brethren, take heed that ye fall not into a common error of these days of spiritual darkness, and suppose aught of Christ's good gifts have perished from the Church. For all His gifts are contained in His abiding Presence. And wherever there is need, and the requisite faith, the natural world still owns its Master

* S. Mark xvi. 17.

and shows itself subordinate to the spiritual necessities of His Kingdom.

Doubtless, when such manifestations were frequent in the Apostles' time, the sick, and the sick man's friends, with our natural infirmity of clinging to this life, would be prone to seek out those to whom the special gifts of healing or miracles had been vouchsafed, or who were supposed to possess them. It was possibly to check this tendency that the grave and holy patriarch S. James, presiding over the Church at Jerusalem, and, as the organ of the Holy Ghost, speaking to the whole Church and for all time, promulgated the order for the Christian when sick, telling him what to do and what to expect.

What is he to do? He is not to anxiously seek for persons accounted possessed of miraculous or faith-healing powers, but to send for the priests, the ordinary ministers who are everywhere at hand; for the elders, upon whom, as such, no special gift of healing has been bestowed. So far as the cure of the body is concerned, let the faithful trust themselves to the prayers of the priest. Let them believe that "The effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much." God will hear him just as He did Elijah, if there is need.

But, in this time of sickness the important con-

cern is the soul. Let the priest come and minister to it as the lay faith or mind healer cannot do; let confession be made and sins remitted. And further S. James, who exercised a special authority in matters of Church government and discipline, gave order (based upon the earlier Apostolic use under the Master's direction) that the sick should be anointed with oil.

S. James uses the plural form "elders," "call for the Elders of the Church" not as excluding the ministrations of a single priest, but as manifesting the oneness of the priesthood and the efficacy that comes from united prayer. The term used, viz., "Elder," excludes the unordained layman and the deacon; it includes the Bishop. For while the layman may act as a spiritual door-keeper of the Church, and, in case of necessity, admit souls by the Sacrament of Baptism, he cannot, being unordained, minister to those within in aught that requires consecration. The deacon may, indeed, bear the chalice of the Precious Blood, and communicate the faithful, yet cannot assist in ministering the gifts of grace which are disciplinary and restorative. So it is the elder or priest who is here bidden to "pray over the sick and anoint him with oil, in the name of the Lord."

The oil, for the Church does everything de-

cently and in order, is prayerfully set apart for its holy purpose.*

The consecration of the oil shows that God blesses natural restoratives—"the medicine He gives to heal our sickness" †—and it witnesses against those who wantonly reject all use of medicine. "Honor a physician with the honor due to him. The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them." ‡ Its consecration further declares that the benefit comes not from the natural

* In the holy orthodox Eastern Church it is consecrated by seven priests. In our western portion of Christendom it has been reserved, as of propriety, to the bishop. The priest, indeed, can consecrate the Host and absolve the penitent, for he has jurisdiction over the natural and spiritual Body of Christ, but he does not consecrate the sacred oils. For while the "Sacraments of the Gospel" are administered by the priest, the Sacraments of the Spirit, *i.e.*, Ordination, Confirmation, and Unction, appertain primarily to the bishop. In all these the presbytery may assist: in laying on of hands in Ordination, in administering the Chrism in Confirmation, when it is so administered, and in anointing the sick with the holy oil which the bishop has blessed.

The merciful providence of God, by the ordering of events, did away with the form of anointing set forth in the first Prayer-Book of Edward, which was defective in not providing authoritatively for the consecration of the oil. No national church, nor, indeed, a general council, can abrogate God's word, nor set aside a means of grace; and though the Anglican Church has been deprived of an office authorized by common authority, it has been providentially preserved from one which the rest of Christendom would have regarded as defective.

† Ps. cxlvii. 3.

‡ Eccles. xxxviii. 1, 4.

means alone, but by the added power of the word of God. For it is a common law that by Sacraments all life, natural and spiritual, is given and preserved. The food we eat is a Sacrament communicating life in the natural order, as the Eucharist is in the heavenly. The consecration of the oil moreover connects the outward symbol with Christ, the Anointed Healer of mankind, who is the remedy for all our woes, and it signifies the spiritual blessings we are to receive from Him. For Sacraments are, as our Articles declare, *effectual* signs of grace, *i.e.*, they effect what they signify. And the Holy Spirit tells us, by S. James, what the effect here will be. Body and soul of the sick alike need help. If he hath committed sins, let him confess them, and let prayer be made for his healing. The prayer of faith and the anointing shall then avail "to save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Observe here most carefully that all the terms used—the "saving," and "raising up," and "forgiveness of sin"—imply, as your Bibles will in many places declare unto you, a *spiritual* benefit. "The engrafted word, which is able to save your souls."* God "hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in

* S. James i. 21.

Christ Jesus."* "Like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."†

Now, whatever may be the primary object of the sick man's desire—to get well or not—of a *spiritual* benefit the *soul* must be the primary recipient. To this the bodily benefit which may follow is incidental and subordinate.

You will perceive from all this that the Church's established order for Christian anointing differs from the act of the disciples described in S. Mark. Then, the Holy Ghost had not been given. Their baptism, like that of S. John Baptist, was but an outward sign, without an accompanying inward grace. Their anointing was but a sign of Christ's coming, and a communication of a gift of mere bodily health. After Pentecost, the Church is established. The Holy Spirit dwells ever after in her. In this dispensation of the Spirit a higher plane of power and blessing is reached. The gifts are spiritual. The soul is the primary recipient of them, and the body receives its blessing as it is subordinate to the soul, and as it is saved, raised up, and forgiven.

In contrast with the other Sacraments we see that Unction has its own special significance. As Baptism is by way of washing, and as Commun-

* Eph. ii. 6.

† Rom. vi. 4.

ion is by way of food, Unction uses a remedial agent and removes infirmities. In Baptism we are regenerated, in Confirmation fortified, in Communion fed, in Penance restored, by Unction we are healed, assuaged, gladdened, calmed, refreshed.

Wounded in its life-contest with its ever-present enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil, the penitent soul takes refuge in the absolving word of Christ ministered to us by His priests. When sickness, with its trials, its anxieties, its temptations, its fears, and doubts, and weariness, comes upon us, when spiritual assaults are more keenly felt, and the spirit is apt to faint, and the avenue that leads to the great unknown begins to hem us in, then comes the Unction that brightens, cheers, strengthens, assuages, heals—a fresh anointing from the Great Anointed, breathing of peace and calmness—as a final adornment and preparation for presentation at the court of the Great King.

It is not to be used when illness is but trifling, nor properly just when the sick is in extremis, as it is mistakenly asserted the Roman Church only employs it;* but when illness is “serious” it may be resorted to, or when by reason of illness

* It is called extreme unction in the Roman Church, because it is the last unction administered, and because it is a preparation for death.

there is danger of death. It is not to be administered to young children, because it requires acts spiritual, but to those who have come to years of discretion. The recipient must be a baptized person. The organs of the five senses are usually anointed, but one anointing, *i.e.*, on the head, is held to suffice. It may be repeated.

That the chief end of the Sacrament is the communication of some spiritual benefit, and not bodily healing, is seen from this. Had the chief end of this Sacrament been bodily restoration, we should have found considerable evidence of its use, and references to the healings effected, in the writings of the early centuries. But if the purpose of its promulgation by S. James was to lead men away from resorting to the miraculous or faith healing gifts to the ordered ministration of the clergy for the spiritual needs of the sick, we naturally should find in early writings but little said concerning it. And this is the case. As a spiritual aid in time of serious illness, it did not enter into the teachings of the Catechumens, as Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, and the Eucharist necessarily did. It did not have to find a place in the Apologies. It was not, like Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, a necessity. Its use would be limited and infrequent in times of persecution. It could not, like the Blessed Sacrament, be borne to the sick by lay hands.

Its use would naturally be further limited by the mixed marriages of Christians and heathen, and the difficulty of performing a Christian rite in the presence of the latter.

But its existence in the Church as a usable means of grace is witnessed to, not only by indirect and imperfect references made to it by Origen, S. Ephrem, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria, and clearly by S. Innocent, but by the practice of heretics mentioned by S. Irenæus in the second century, and in later times by the concurrent custom of the Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, and all the Orientals, who in this matter are at one with the Western Church.

This common and abiding usage in the Church East and West is a witness that the promulgation by S. James, in his singular position as Presiding Apostle at Jerusalem, was not to serve a temporary purpose; that it was not a practice, like the kiss of peace or the washing of the feet, which the Church would preserve in its public ceremonial rites, but that it was a means of grace intended for all Christian people through all time.

The Word of God may be neglected, but it cannot be repealed. It abideth forever.

Whatever Christ, by Himself or through His Apostles, instituted for the conveying of grace to the soul, is of perpetual and enduring value.

God forbid that our Communion, thankful for

all that the providence of God has done for it, should be unwilling to acknowledge any of its short-comings, or fail to claim all its Catholic heritage, or abstain from seeking to regain this Holy Anointing, which the late learned and saintly Bishop of Brechin called "the lost Pleiad of the Anglican Communion."

II. MATRIMONY.

Let us turn now to our second topic. Man, created in the image of God, bears witness of Him. Humanity was divided, by the creative evolutionary action, into male and female. As the Son is begotten of the Father, and is God *of* God and Light *of* Light, this mystery was shadowed forth in that the woman is represented as taken of the very substance of the man. She was bone of his bone, flesh of his flesh. As the Father and Son are eternally united by the action of the Holy Ghost which proceeds from each, so the man and the woman were united in matrimony. They were to typify, by their mutual love and the permanence of their marriage relation, the life of God in Himself.

The Incarnation began a new creation. There is a new bridegroom, Jesus Christ. A new bride, the Church. She is formed, by Sacraments, out of His side. She is bone of His bone, flesh of

His flesh. And marriage has now a new symbolic meaning, and has received, for its higher mission and greater task, the grace needed for its fulfilment.

Christian marriage, *i.e.*, the marriage of the baptized, is now to bear witness to the mystery of Christ and the Church. It is to bear witness to three great facts concerning it.

The oneness of the Bridegroom and His all-satisfying love.

The oneness of the Church and its organic unity.

The inseparability of the union, which neither life nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, nor any creature, can sever.

Let me speak to you of the different ways by which, through the grace given by Christ, Christian marriage is made to fulfil this high and three-fold office.

Concerning the first—the One Bridegroom and His all-satisfying love—you must remember that Christ has instituted two kinds of marriage: the marriage of the baptized man and woman to one another, and the mystical marriage of either to Himself in the religious state.

The religious state, my brethren, was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a state, as you may know, of entire self-consecration and is founded on the three counsels of poverty, chas-

tity, and obedience. These counsels our Lord gave at different times, saying to the rich young man who came to Him, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all that thou hast and come and follow Me;"* when Apostles disputed who should be greatest, putting a little child before them and saying: "He that will be greatest among you, let him become as a little child." Again, He taught them: "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." "There be eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."† He clearly designated here, you observe, a permanent and unalterable state.

He exemplified these counsels in His own life—by His voluntarily assumed poverty, when He left His home at Nazareth and became a wanderer, having no place where to lay His Head; by His abandonment of His blessed mother, when He separated from her at Cana's feast till His hour should come; by His obedience to the minute course and rule of life laid down for Him by prophecy and type in the Scriptures; and which He fulfilled to the letter, subjecting His human will to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

In this life of voluntary poverty, chastity, and

* S. Matt. xix. 21.

† S. Matt. xix. 11, 12.

obedience, He trained the Apostles. The early Church was full of the spirit of this life; for it is to be shared in by every Christian, according to his vocation. It took, under Apostolic direction, a recognized form. There were the "widows" * or consecrated virgins, as we hear from S. Ignatius the latter were called. S. Paul gives order concerning this ecclesiastical institute (S. Tim. chap. v. 9-16) as well as concerning natural widows who were simply Church beneficiaries (S. Tim. chap. v. 3-8). He commended the state by his own example and exhortation. "He that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord how he may please the Lord." Every age of the Church has been enriched by this life of entire consecration. The greatest missionaries of the Church have come forth from its organizations. The state, changing in outward form, has ever preserved its internal principles. These were given by the Master. And the life is thus an integral portion

* "In the sub-apostolic age *Χήρα*, widow had an *ecclesiastical*, as well as a *natural* meaning; it was even used of women who had never been married, but who had consecrated themselves to God in a single life. Cf. S. Ignatius ad Smyrn, c. 13: 'The virgins who are called widows.' It would appear probable that in the Apostolic age all women consecrated to God in a single life, and for doing works of mercy, formed a single *τάγμα* or order. One aspect of such a general institute was developed in this portion of the Church and another in that. In time the different elements of the common apostolic institute became distinct bodies." Liddon's Notes on S. Timothy.

of Christianity. To be destitute of it is to be wanting in a requisite token of the Church of Christ. For nothing can our Communion be more grateful to God than for the renewal of this life within this century.

"Blessed, thrice blessed, they," as a saintly servant of God wrote,* "to whom Christ alone sufficeth, the one aim of whose being is to live to Him and for Him. For Him they adorn themselves; His eyes alone they desire to please through His graces in them; Him they long to serve without distraction; at His feet they ever sit; to Him they speak in their inmost souls, to Him they hearken. He is their light, their love, their holy joy; to Him they ever approach with trustfulness; Him they consult in all things, on Him they wait. Him they love, even because they love Him, and desire nothing from Him but His love, desire no love but only His. Blessed foretaste of life eternal, to desire nothing on earth but the life of angels, and the new song; to be wholly His, whom her soul loveth, and He, the Lord of angels, to be wholly hers, as she says, 'I am my Beloved's and my Beloved is mine.'"

Blessed indeed as this life is to those consecrated ones who walk faithfully in it, its value to the Church lies in the standing witness it bears

* Pusey. Par. Sermons, vol. ii. *The Sacredness of Marriage.*

to the supreme importance of the eternal world; to the moral law of self-sacrifice by which the Divine life is attained, and pre-eminently as it sets forth the mystery of the oneness of the Bridegroom and the all-sufficiency of His love.

How was the second point—the oneness of the Church, as the one Bride—to be proclaimed? The answer is, by the Gospel law regulating the marriage of the priests.

Where the stricter line, counselled by S. Paul, is not taken, and the priest marries, the New Testament allows him to be married but once. This law is set forth very explicitly in God's Word, in the special epistle given for the selection, ordination, and discipline of the Christian ministry. Speaking of the two lower orders of the clergy, S. Paul writes:* "A bishop"—an elder or presbyter—"must be blameless, the husband of *one* wife." In like manner he says of the deacons: "Let the deacons be the husbands of *one* wife."

There are only three possible interpretations of this divinely given Church law, viz., that the priest *must* be married; that he must not have been or be a polygamist; that he must marry, if at all, only once.

It is not difficult to see which of these is the correct one and expresses the mind of God.

* 1 S. Tim. iii. 2, 12.

The text cannot mean that the priest *must* be married, for this construction ignores the significance and use of the word "one." The text does not say that he must be married, but must be the husband but of *one* wife. It is also entirely irreconcilable with what S. Paul counsels in 1 Cor. vii. 7, and would make God's Word contradict itself. "It would suggest—with equal reason—that he *must* have children (*cf.* ver. 4) because, if he has them, the Apostle gives rules concerning them." *

This law for the clergy cannot be construed as merely prohibiting their indulgence in polygamy. For no special reason can be assigned why the clergy should be thus warned against that which, equally with murder and theft, was regarded as a crime by all Christians. Nor can the meaning be the exclusion from Holy Orders of those who had been polygamists before their conversion, for at this time simultaneous polygamy had disappeared among the Jews, and was regarded as infamous by Greeks and Romans.

There is but one conclusion left. The text means, and can have no other meaning than this: that, by God's command, the clergy cannot lawfully marry more than once. This interpretation is put beyond all question, by the parallel command given respecting the women. The "widow "

* Liddon.

who is to be admitted into the ecclesiastical order of widows, is required to be the "wife of one husband." * This cannot mean a prohibition against her having several husbands at the same time, as if other women might, but that she should be but once married; and so in respect of the admission of men to the ecclesiastical order, the command that the presbyter and deacon shall be the husband of *one* wife prohibits successive, not a simultaneous, polygamy.

The spiritual reason for this command is, that the ideal of marriage, which suggests that of Christ and His Church, is violated by a second marriage. There is but one Bridegroom, Jesus Christ, and one bride, the Church. It is to this fact the clergy are to bear witness, not merely by sermons about the One Holy Catholic Church, but by the more emphatic and persuasive witness of a life involving a special sacrifice. It was by their acts and lives the prophets of old so effectively taught, and so now would Christ have His stewards and ambassadors in the same impressive manner bear witness to a sensualized and blinded world. Of old, the high priest could marry but once, and then only a virgin. His marriage was to typify Christ and His Church. And that which under the law was bound on the high priest only, now in the fulness of the Gospel

* 1 S. Tim. v. 9.

grace is made the law of every Christian priest. Bodies which have lost the priesthood, have lost with it the sense of its sanctity and obligation. But for Church clergy to preach about the one Church and marry twice, is to break a clear commandment and deny by their action what they preach. Our Anglican Communion in America has been so surrounded by the nebulous and shattered Christianity of the sects, that, like Israel affected by her sojourn at Babylon, our spiritual insight has suffered, and the elevating voice of some re-establishing Ezra * is needed to recall us to our forgotten obligations.

The mystical marriage to Christ of the religious declares the oneness of the Bridegroom, the single marriage of the priest the oneness of the Bride, the eternal union between Christ and His Church is witnessed by the *indissolubility* of Christian marriage.

A consummated Christian marriage is absolutely indissoluble. Priests are not bound to unite persons out of their cures. They should be careful not to marry without witnesses, or to marry persons suspected of running away or being under age; or in any way which is not public; or where the conditions of entering into matrimony soberly and in the fear of God are disregarded; or, save in exceptional cases, other

* Ezra ix. 1-5.

than in church; and should always make strict inquiry concerning the parties' previous state and relation to each other, and whether they have been baptized, as the blessing of the Church can be given only to such. There are impediments to marriage which may enable the Church to declare void a marriage. There are ecclesiastical restrictions which may be dispensed; but the bond of matrimony cannot be broken.*

The teaching of the Master is most clear: "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery." "If a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery." † "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." ‡ "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her." § The Apostolic

* In the Holy Roman Church no marriage can be dissolved except in three cases. "First, when of two unbaptized persons, man and wife, the one is converted, and the unconverted party refuses to live peaceably in wedlock, the convert may marry again, and thereupon also the other party. So the Church understands S. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 13, 15. Again, the Pope can grant a divorce *a vinculo* in the marriage of baptized persons before cohabitation. Such a marriage in that stage is also dissolved by the profession of one of the parties in a religious order. Beyond these three cases the Catholic Church allows neither the lawfulness nor the validity of any divorce *a vinculo* by whomsoever given, to whatsoever parties."—Rickaby, S. J., "Moral Philosophy," p. 274.

† S. Matt. xi. 11, 12. ‡ S. Luke xvi. 18. § S. Mark x. 11.

teaching is the same. "And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord, let not the wife depart from her husband. But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." * Both the man and the woman are thus absolutely forbidden to re-marry after separation.

One text alone requires explanation. Our Lord said: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except it be for fornication*, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." † The explanation is this. One school of Jewish teachers had allowed divorce for trifling causes, and the Master rebukes this practice, and gives as the only excuse for a *separation* the sin He names. ‡ Now an excuse for separation is not a permission to re-marry. For He does not say: "Whosoever shall *marry* another, except it be for fornication, committeth adultery." But the exception is placed after and applies only to *separation*, which S. Matthew, writing for the Jews, who had disputed about this matter, alone records. It does not apply to the marrying again, which our Lord in every other place absolutely forbids.

* 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

† S. Matt. xix. 9.

‡ Into the dispute between the meaning of the term used it is not necessary to enter. The word is *πορνεία* (fornication), not *μοιχεία* (adultery). See Dr. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii., 262, 359. Liddon's University Ser., *Human Law*, note.

In this respect our American Church is not yet in entire accord with the preponderating witness in regard to Christ's teaching as given by the undivided Church.*

Since we assert with much confidence in our Articles that National Churches have erred and do err, so we ought to have the courage and humility to acknowledge that our American Church has erred also, in not sufficiently guarding the inviolability of marriage. Our nation is sunk in pollution, in this matter of marriage, out of which only some scourge of God can seemingly deliver it. Yet not so only, let us hope, but also by the blessed influences that go forth from Christian homes, where the grace of Christ forms the true bond

* A learned Anglican canonist, the Rev. G. Bayfield Roberts, thus sums up the ancient Church law on the subject: "Of twenty councils, *seven* allow the re-marriage of the innocent party, *under certain circumstances*, viz.: Vannes (465); an Irish synod of uncertain date; two councils of Rome (826, 853); Worms (868); Bourges (1031); Limoges II (1031); the two latter councils being constituted by the same Bishops. *Thirteen* absolutely forbid re-marriage: Apostolical canons, received by the great Council of Trullo (692); Elvira (305); Arles (314); Carthage (407); Milevis (416); Hertford (673); Nantes (658); Soissons (744); Fruili (791); Toul II (860); Aix III (862); Tribur (895); Trosle (909). Now, putting aside the obscure Council of Vannes, which only virtually, not specifically, permits re-marriage, and that to the man only, and the Irish synod, of unknown date and of questionable authenticity, there remain only five councils which permit re-marriage, at two of which the same Bishops were present. This reduces the number to *four*, of which the earliest in date is 826,

of that marriage union which is typical of the enduring relation of Christ and His Church.

“‘Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the Church.’ Love as He loved who loved the Church more than Himself, and gave Himself for her. Love as He loved who loved souls not for what they were but for what He would make them. We love after the pattern of Christ when we love in one another the deathless beauty of the soul which Christ gives; when we love in despite of defects which Christ will by His grace remove; when we are patient and forbearing with what Christ has not yet removed, looking and longing for His transforming grace now, yet onward still to that mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself. This

and not one is of any special weight. On the other hand, *thirteen* councils absolutely forbid re-marriage, and among them are several councils of the greatest weight and authority. The Canon law on the subject was, at any rate, definitely settled for the whole Church by the year 692, when (if not before) the African code was added to the existing Greek code. The former explicitly condemned re-marriage after divorce, and by its reception in the East obtained œcumenical sanction. The counter evidence of a few obscure and insignificant local councils may fairly be dismissed as of no weight, and as having been influenced by the laxity of the civil law.”

“The Eastern Church discountenances such marriages, and it is only since the eleventh century that it has tolerated them.”

The American Church canons allow of re-marriage of the innocent party. The English Church does not.

love shall grow with years, as the love of Christ and the grace of Christ, which is the beauty of the soul, grows and is enlarged in each. This love shall be refined and purified by sickness and the wasting of the body, as the soul shall lay aside its dross. This love shall not decay, much less die after the body's death. For souls which are united in Christ shall not be separated from Christ; they shall live on still, one in the one love of Christ. Love, then, with a love which shall not pass away; a love of Christ, from Christ, in Christ, to Christ. So shall love be perfected in the abiding fulness of that transporting, deifying love when God shall be all in all and we shall be like Him who is love, and we, 'accepted in Christ Jesus,' 'shall see Him as He is.' " *

III.

Briefly, dear brethren, must I speak of Penance, the third subject assigned me. Let me put before you two preliminary thoughts. First, the power of the priesthood to remit or retain sins.

God only can forgive sins. He has, however, committed this power in the new dispensation to Christ as the Son of Man. It is His by two gifts. The gift of the indwelling Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given "without measure to Him"

* Abbreviated from Pusey: Sermon on Marriage.

and dwelt within His human nature and empowered it. Secondly, the gift of the commission and anointing received at His baptism. Possessed by these two gifts of this authority He wrought a miracle to show that as Son of Man He had power to forgive sins.

Of this power He made the Apostles partakers by two acts. When, after saluting all who were present,* He next saluted the Apostles † and breathing on them, said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," ‡ He thus made them partakers of the *ministerial authority* He received at His baptism. When according to His promise made the Apostles, that they should be endued with power from on high, § the Holy Spirit descended and abode within them at Pentecost, He then made them the *spiritual agents* of His absolving power.

The terms in which their commission is given are comprehensive. || It was not a mere power

* S. John xx. 19. † v. 20. ‡ v. 19, 21. § S. Luke xxiv. 49.

|| "The pastors of the Church may be understood to remit or retain sin in divers ways. 1. They remit sins *dispositive*, by working in persons fit dispositions, upon which remission of sins, by God's promise, is consequent; the dispositions of faith and repentance. 2. They remit (or retain) sins *declarative*, as the ambassadors of God, in His name pronouncing the word of reconciliation to the penitent, and denouncing wrath to the obstinate in sin. 3. They remit sins *impetrative*, obtaining pardon for sins

to remove Church censures. "I cannot," says Maurice, "in any case read 'punishment' where I find 'sin' written. I must regard remission of punishment as a very poor and miserable substitute for remission of sins."* Also it was not, says Bishop Andrewes, "a personal privilege to be in them and to die with them, that they should only execute it for a time, and none ever after them. God forbid we should so think it."† It was a power to be exercised by the priesthood throughout all time.

The laity have their share in the priesthood and exercise it by interceding for one another and forgiving injuries done to themselves; but the Priest speaks for Christ and absolves from sin as against God. It is not a mere declaration that God will forgive or for Christ's sake has forgiven, but a communication of grace. When the Puritans at the Savoy Conference asked, "that the form of absolution be declarative and conditional, as 'I pronounce thee absolved,' instead of 'I absolve thee,' the Bishops replied: 'The form of absolution in the Liturgy is more agreeable to

by their prayers. 4. They remit sins *dispensative*, by consigning pardon in administration of the Sacraments, especially in conferring Baptism, whereby, duly administered and undertaken, all sins are washed away, and in the absolving of penitents."—Dr. Isaac Barrow: *Power of the Keys*, Works, vii., 365.

* Maurice: *The Gospel of St. John*, p. 456.

† Andrewes: *Sermon on Absolution*, Works, v., 91.

the Scriptures than that which they desire, it being said in S. John xx., "Whose sins you remit, they are remitted," not "Whose sins you pronounce remitted."'''* So our Church has ever held and taught.

The form for personal absolution given in the English Prayer-Book, from which ours has not departed in doctrine, is: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

This is the teaching of the Word of God and of our Church on Absolution. †

The second thought I bring you is this. It is by all admitted that the baptized soul by grievous sin or habit of sin may be rightly cut off from the body of Christ and become excommunicate. To be by sin in this sad condition is to be outside the Ark. How can we be reunited to Christ and restored to our covenanted privileges? The regularly ordained way as our XXXIII Article declares is by "Penance." In the early Church this was public. Now it is

* Cardwell: *Conferences*, 3d ed., Oxford, 1849, pp. 332, 361.

† See Appendix.

rarely so and is privately administered.* And note that the declarations of absolution in Morning and Evening prayer are not a judicial exercise of the power of the keys. They have their place. They do a work. They avail to the cleansing of imperfections and minor transgressions and are part of that perpetual cleansing and advancing purification Christ is ever bestowing on the faithful. But they are parts of offices of the Church, said by the Church, and properly avail for those in the body and not for those out of it as the excommunicate are.

The regularly ordained way by which the excommunicate may be restored on repentance to their former estate, is by the ministry of reconciliation.

Nor is it those only who are excommunicate formally or de facto or who are under sentence of death who may avail themselves of this privilege. All souls distressed by the burden of sin and who cannot quiet their own conscience, be the burden what it may, are lovingly invited by the Priest in the words of the English Prayer-Book, "to come to me or to some other minister of God's word and open their grief that they may receive the benefit of absolution."

Not once in fifty years do the silver trumpets of the jubilee sound, but perpetually do they

* See Rubric Visitations of Prisoners.

proclaim under the Gospel the proffered restoration of our lost estate.

In conclusion, dear brethren, let me say a word to you on the general subject of the confession of our sins to God in the presence of a Priest. There is a technical and disputatious way of regarding it and a devotional and common-sense one. For most persons at some times in their lives do I believe it will be found helpful, but the thought I would leave you to-night, and especially I address myself to the gentlemen here present, is, that such a confession is, for the loyal churchman and the noble-minded man, *the way of honor*. Sometimes souls resort to confession because they desire to have that same absolving word Christ spoke to penitents: "'Son,' 'daughter,' thy sins be forgiven thee. Go in peace," said personally to themselves. They want not to be left concerning their acceptance to the uncertainty of their own varying feelings, but to possess the pledged assurance Christ left in the Gospel. They come again not merely to know they are forgiven but for the larger grace that absolution gives, the healing of the wounds of sin and the fortifying of the soul against future temptation. But these motives spring from self and our own needs. There is a further and more constraining motive which affects us men. It is the motive of honor. Whenever in heat of temper

by word or act you have wronged another, you feel your own manhood stained until you have by an apology made reparation. And by your code of honor you make the reparation, privately or publicly, according as your insult has been a public or private one and proportionate to its character. Now as conscientious Christians we must acknowledge the difference between our sins and those of old time. We have sinned after that God by becoming Incarnate has shown us in the crucifixion how sin stabs His heart. We have sinned not against the invisible God as Patriarchs and Jews did, but against Christ the Son of Man. And honor demands that our acknowledging act of reparation should be made not to the invisible God but to Jesus Christ, and since it cannot be made to God visible in the flesh, should be made to the visible man or Priest who represents Him. This is the way of honor, and the way of honor is the manly and ennobling way and the way of peace.

This is man's side of confession, but then there is Christ's side. He loves to forgive. He loves to renew His forgiveness to the increasing purification of the soul. For Christian repentance and Christ's forgiveness are progressive.

You have been forgiven. Christ has touched your heart. It may be years ago. You feel you are His. You are walking with Him. The

power of sin has been broken. You know His love and peace. But with your advance there is an ever-abiding sorrow for forgiven sin and a deepening sense of sin's enormity, of your sinfulness and your ingratitude. You understand why the Church at every Communion would have us say of our sins, "the burden of them is intolerable." This deepening sense of sin has its parallel in common life. The child sins against its parents, it repents and is forgiven. The long years go on. The child grows up and has children of its own. It realizes what a father's or mother's love is. And as the hairs of that dear head are whitening and the step becomes feeble and the hour of departure may be at hand, the loving heart tells again its old childish transgression and asks anew for the word of forgiveness. "You are quite sure you have forgiven me all that?" "Why my child," says the dear old saint, "I forgave you that long ago." "Yes, dear mother or father, but I just wanted to hear you say it again, when I know now as never before the pain I must have given." And the kiss tells more than of forgiveness, it tells of undying and eternal union in love. And so the soul increasing in holiness, increasingly realizes Christ's sorrow and love, and takes up the loving plaint of forgiven David, "Wash me *more and more* from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin."

And on His side, oh, remember how Christ loves to forgive, to cleanse, to purify, to adorn, to perfect the soul by His perpetual absolutions.

No mother loves to adorn and deck her child as Christ loves to beautify the soul. The more He sees the likeness of Himself in any soul, the more He loves it and desires to make it yet more worthy of His love. His patience is never wearied. His grace is never exhausted. Every act of trust gladdens His heart. Every resort to the ministries of His grace baffles His foes. If we have caused that Sacred Heart to grieve by our sins, our neglects, our shortcomings, our waste of grace, let us by a sorrow after a godly sort, by clearing of ourselves by indignation, by vehement desire, by zeal, yea by revenge taken upon ourselves, make it rejoice. The power of absolution is inherent in every priest, the privilege of using that gift is the right of every penitent soul.

APPENDIX.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

THE controversies that have raged about this subject in the past, and the differences of opinion about it which exist in the Church at the present time, will be found on examination to be superficial rather than fundamental; that is to say, there is not so much dispute in regard to the position of the Church, which is sufficiently clear, as there is in regard on the one hand to the Roman practice of compulsory confession, and on the other to the Protestant practice of no confession at all. The contest has been largely between those who advocate these different practices on various grounds which are aside from the teaching of the Church.

In the notes that follow authorities are collected to show what the Church's position is. When this is seen, the controversy really ceases to be a practical one, and becomes merely an academic debate between two contentions which are both outside of the Church.

These authorities are grouped in three divisions: 1, the legislation of the Church as expressed in formularies and canons; 2, the teaching and practice of the Church, as exhibited in (a) visitation articles of Bishops and (b) writings of eminent divines.

I. THE LEGISLATION OF THE CHURCH AS EXPRESSED IN FORMULARIES AND CANONS.

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost

forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." [*Book of Common Prayer, Form and Manner of Ordaining Priests.*] Such are the solemn and awful words of the Ordinal pronounced by the Bishop as he places his hands on the head of the candidate whom by that declaration and act he advances to the Priesthood. Although it is God alone who forgives sins, yet He forgives them by His ministers who have received the power of absolution through the gift of the Holy Ghost.

In the Preface to the American Prayer-Book we read: "That this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require." In the English Book the intending communicant "who cannot quiet his own conscience" is bidden to go to his parish priest, "or to some other discreet and learned * minister of God's holy Word and open his grief; that by the Ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his own conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." And in the American Book, "Let him come to me or to some other

* "Discreet" and "learned" are both technical terms well known to the Canon Law, and mean approved by the Bishop as learned and discreet, that is, trained in moral divinity and otherwise fitted for the office of confessor. "It is not allowed to any Greek Priest to act as confessor, but only to discreet persons, advanced in years, to whom a faculty for that purpose is given by the Bishop to whom they are subject." *Smith's Ecc. Grac. Oxf.* 1676, p. 115.

Minister of God's Word and open his grief, that he may receive such godly counsel and advice as may tend to the quieting of his conscience and the removing of all scruple and doubtfulness."

In the Office for the Visitation of the Sick in the English Prayer-Book the Priest is ordered to move the sick person "to make a special confession of his sins," after which he is directed to absolve him in these words, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences. And by His authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen."

In the American Book in the Office for the Visitation of Prisoners, the Priest is directed to exhort the prisoner "to a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned," and after the confession has been made "to declare to him the pardoning mercy of God in the form which is used in the Communion Service."

In the Canons of 1603 the regular practice of confession is taken for granted. The 113th Canon enjoins secrecy on the Minister* in respect to all confessions confided to him, in these terms: "Provided always, that if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister, for the unburthening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him, we do not in

* Before the time of the Commonwealth the term Minister was used as equivalent to Priest, but during that period became perverted from its original meaning. Accordingly the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, in revising the Prayer-Book substituted the word Priest for that of Minister in the Rubric before the Absolution so as to preclude Deacons.

any way bind the said Minister by this our Constitution, but do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time reveal or make known to any person whatsoever, any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy (except they be such crimes as by the Laws of this Realm his own life may be called in question for concealing the same), under pain of irregularity."* *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, John Blunt, D.D., Revised and Enlarged Edition, p. 446.*

In 1634 Canons modelled on the English enactments were introduced into Ireland. They were drawn up by Bishop Bramhall and approved by Archbishop Ussher, the Primate. Canon XIX orders that "The Minister of every parish, and in Collegiate and Cathedral Churches some principal Minister of the Church, shall, the afternoon before the said administration" [of the Holy Communion], "give warning, by the tolling of the bell, or otherwise, to the intent that if any have any scruple of conscience, or desire the special Ministry of reconciliation, he may afford it to those who need it. And to this end the people are often to be exhorted to enter into a special examination of their own souls; and that, finding themselves either extremely dull, or so much troubled in mind, they do resort unto God's Ministers to receive from them as well advice and counsel for the quickening of their dead hearts and the subduing of those corruptions whereunto they have been subject, as the benefit of absolution like-

* "In Ecclesiastical Law 'irregularity' means *deprivation*, accompanied by a perpetual incapacity for taking any benefice whatever. It is the severest punishment which can be inflicted on a Clergyman under the Canon Law, short of degradation from his Orders." *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, note 2, p. 446.*

wise, for the quieting of their consciences, by the power of the Keys which Christ has committed to His Ministers for that purpose." *Wilkins' Concilia, tom. iv., p. 501.*

In 1635 Canons were sent up by the Scottish Bishops to Charles I for approval, and were revised by Laud and Juxon. Among these was the following: "Albeit Sacramental Confession and Absolution have been in some places very much abused; yet if any of the people be grieved in mind for any delict or offence committed, and for the unburthening of his conscience confess the same to the Bishop or Presbyter; they shall, as they are bound, minister to the person so confessing all spiritual consolations out of the Word of God; and shall not deny him the benefit of Absolution after the manner which is prescribed in the Visitation of the Sick, if the party show himself truly penitent, and humbly desire to be absolved." "*The Church and the World,*" 1876, p. 210. *Revd. J. C. Chambers.*

To this may be added also the testimony of the Homilies of which the Thirty-fifth Article of Religion speaks in these terms: "The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people."

In the Homily on "Common Prayer and Sacraments," p. 376, we are told that "Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," and in that on "Repentance and a true Reconciliation unto God," p. 577, we read: "I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in

conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's Word."

II. TEACHING AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH AS EXHIBITED IN

(a) VISITATION ARTICLES OF BISHOPS.

In 1567 Archbishop Parker in his Visitation articles directs: "VI item. You shall enquire of the doctrine and judgment of all and singular hedd and members of your Church . . . whether any of them do either privalie or openlie preach or teach any unwholesome, erroneous, seditious doctrine . . . or in other point do perswade or move any not to conform themselves to the order of religion, reformed, restored, and received by public authority in the Church of England. As for example . . . that every article in our crede, commonly received and used in the Church is not to be received of necessity; OR THAT MORTAL OR VOLUNTARY SINS, COMMITTED AFTER BAPTISM, BE NOT REMISSABLE BY PENANCE." *Wilkins' Concilia, tom. iv., p. 253.*

Bishop Overall, the author of the section of the Church Catechism which treats of the Sacraments, in the 1st Article of his Visitation in 1619 asks: "Whether doth your Minister before the several times of the administration of the Lord's Supper, admonish and exhort his parishioners if they have their consciences troubled and disquieted, to resort unto him, or some other learned Minister, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel and comfort as his conscience may be re-

lieved, and by the Minister he may receive the benefit of Absolution, to the quiet of his conscience and avoiding of scruple. And if any man confess his secret and hidden sins, be he sick or whole, to the Minister, for the unburthening of his conscience, and receiving such spiritual consolation, doth or hath the said Minister at any time revealed and made known to any person whomsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust, contrary to the 113th Canon?" *Second Report of the Commissioners on Rubrics*, p. 483.

In 1625 Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, makes the same inquiry in the same words. *Second Report of the Commissioners on Rubrics*, 1868, p. 494.

In 1636 Bishop Dee of Peterborough inquires: "Doth your Minister . . . commonly premonish his Parishioners, if they be troubled in conscience, to confess, and open their grief to him, that they may receive the benefit of absolution?" "*The Doctrine of Absolution*," Maskell, p. 137, note.

In the same year Bishop Wren of Norwich asks: "Whether your Minister before the several times of the administration of the Lord's Supper admonish and exhort his Parishioners, if any of them have their consciences troubled and disquieted, to resort to him, or to some other learned Minister, and open their grief that they may receive the benefit of Absolution? And if any man confess his secret and hidden sins, being sick or whole, to the Minister, for the unburthening of his conscience, and receiving of spiritual consolation or ease of mind from him, doth he the said Minister . . . ever reveal or make known to any person whatever, any crime or offence, so committed to his trust and secrecy?" *Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 560.

In his Visitation Articles in 1638 Bishop Montague inquires: "Doth he" (the Minister) "comfort the sick per-

son as concerning his soul's health, his state to Godward? Doth he upon hearing his confession, which he shall persuade him to make, absolve him from all his sins, settle his faith, affiance, and confidence in God? And hath he at any time discovered any part of his confession?

"Doth he especially exhort his parishioners to make confession of their sins to himself or some other learned, grave, and discreet Minister, especially in Lent against that holy time of Easter; and that they may receive comfort and absolution, and so become worthy receivers of such sacred mysteries?" *Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 583.

And in the same year Bishop Duppa of Peterborough asks: "Hath your Minister at any time revealed the confession of any made to him in secret, contrary to the 113th Canon, and so hath brought a scandal upon the ancient Remedy of sin and sinners?" *Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 577.

In 1640 Bishop Juxon of London makes the same inquiry in substantially the same language. *Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 591. As do also Bishops Gunning of Ely in 1678 (*Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 648), Fuller of Lincoln in 1668 (*Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 635), Turner of Ely in 1686 ("The Doctrine of Absolution," *Maskell*, p. 137, note), Fleetwood of St. Asaph in 1710 (*Second Report, etc.*, 1868, p. 667), and many others.

"It has been shown that in the diocese of Norwich (there was no reason for selecting this diocese for investigation, except that the gentleman who made it is an incumbent there) since the Reformation the majority of the Bishops have at their Visitations made inquiries concerning Confession which implied both its practice and its use." "*A Contribution to the Cause of Christian Unity*," *O'Neill*, p. 89.

In the year 1640 Convocation ordered that at all Epis-

copal and Archidiaconal Visitations the following inquiry should be made of all Church Wardens: "Have you ever heard that your said Priest or Minister hath revealed and made known at any time to any person whatsoever any crime or offence committed to his trust and secrecy, either in extremes of sickness, or in other case whatsoever . . . Declare the name of the offender when and by whom you heard the same." *Heylin on the Creed*, p. 486.

This laid down a general rule by which all Diocesans in the future were to be governed.

Coming down to our own times, Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury, who died in 1869, in one of his charges speaks thus: "If with the Homily, you ever speak of Absolution and Confession as a Sacrament, you must indicate this distinction of your Church; and you may be thankful that through this very distinction, you are the more free to insist upon the Penitents having those dispositions, which are the necessary qualifications for Absolution, and to warn persons against the exceeding peril of profaning that holy ordinance, and so of bringing upon their souls the guilt of sacrilege. At the time of the Reformation such guilt was, it is said, very frequently incurred; and I question not that our Reformers were glad to find themselves justified in making the question of confession one less of obligation than of the claims and privileges of an awakened conscience." *Power of the Priesthood in Absolution*, Canon Cooke, p. 167, 2d ed.

(b) WRITINGS OF EMINENT DIVINES.

In the Catechism put forth by the authority of Archbishop Cranmer in the year 1548, and dedicated by him to Edward VI, we read: "Now God doth not speak to us with a Voice sounding out of heaven; but He hath

given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the authority to forgive sin to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore let him that is a sinner go to one of them. Let him knowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that, according to God's commandments, he will give him absolution, and comfort him with the word of grace and forgiveness of his sins." *Short Instruction into Christian Religion. Oxford, 1829, p. 202.*

Latimer says: "To speak of right and true confession I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing." *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, p. 180, ed. 1844.* And the judicious Hooker affirms: "That our Saviour by those words, 'Whose sins ye remit they are remitted,' did ordain judges over sinful souls, give them authority to absolve from sin, and promise to ratify in heaven whatsoever they should do on earth in execution of this their office." *Ecclesiastical Polity, Book vi., C. vi., 3, p. 486. Ox., 1848.*

Bishop Jewel, who died in 1571, states: "The difference between us and our adversaries on the whole matter is not great: . . . Three kinds of confession are expressed unto us in the Scriptures. The first made secretly unto God alone: the second openly before the whole congregation: the third privately unto our brother. Of the two former kinds there is no question. Touching the third if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and satisfaction of the penitent without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprov'd. . . . Thus much only we say, that private confession to be made unto the Minister is neither commanded by Christ nor necessary to salvation." *Defence of the Apology, Part II., C. vi., Div. I. Works, vol. iv., p. 486. Ox., 1848.*

George Herbert (died 1632), in his "Priest to the Temple," writes: "In his visiting the sick or otherwise af-

flicted he followeth the Church's counsel, namely, in persuading them to particular confession; labouring to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious ordinance, and how necessary it is in some cases."

The Parson Comforting, chap. xv., vol. i., p. 186.

Dr. Donne, Dean of Saint Paul's, whose life has been written by Isaak Walton, the Angler, and whom De Quincey has described in his essay on Casuistry,* as "one of the subtlest intellects that England has produced," writes: "Confiteor Domino, says David, I will confess my sins to the Lord; sins are not confessed if they be not confessed to Him, in case of necessity it will suffice, though they be confessed to no other. Indeed a confession is directed upon God, though it be made to His Minister: if God had appointed His angels or His saints to absolve me, as *He hath His Ministers*, I would confess to them. . . . Men come not willingly to this manifestation of themselves, nor are they to be brought in chains, as they do in the Roman Church, by a necessity of an exact enumeration of all their sins, but to be led with that sweetness with which our Church proceeds, in appointing sick persons, if they feel their consciences troubled with any weighty matter to make a special confession, and to receive absolution at the hands of the priest: and then we are to remember that every coming to the Communion is as serious a thing as our own transmigration out of the world, and we should do as much here for the settling of our consciences as upon our death-bed." *Sermons, lvi., vol. ii., p. 563. London, 1839.*

Dr. Donne was born and brought up in the Roman Church and studied for the ministry in that Communion. He was converted to Anglicanism before middle life. He

* De Quincey's Works, vol. vii., p. 276.

was as remarkable for his piety as he was distinguished by his ability and learning. He died in 1632.

Bishop Montague, who died in 1641, writes: "It is confessed that all priests, and none but priests, have power to forgive sins; it is confessed that private confession unto a priest is of very ancient practice in the Church, of excellent use and practice being discretely handled. We refuse it to none if men require it, if need be to have it. We urge and persuade it in extremes; we require it in cases of perplexity for the quieting of men disturbed and their consciences." *A Gagg for the New Gospel, etc.*, p. 83.

The author of "*The Religion of Protestants*" and of the famous saying, "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," writes: "Since Christ for your benefit and comfort has given such authority to His Ministers, upon your unfeigned repentance and confession, to absolve and release you from your sins . . . therefore, in obedience to His gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoined, by my holy mother, the Church of England, expressly, in the Book of Common Prayer, in the rubric of visiting the sick (which doctrine this Church hath also embraced so far), I beseech you that by your practice and use you will not suffer that commission which Christ has given to His Ministers to be a vain form of words without any sense under them; to be an antiquated, expired commission, of no use nor validity in these days; but whensoever you find yourself charged and oppressed, especially with such crimes as they call '*Peccata vastantia conscientiam*,' such as do lay waste and depopulate the conscience, that you have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease, that he may be able, as the cause shall require, to proportion a remedy, either to search it with corrosives, or comfort and temper it with

oil. AND COME NOT TO HIM ONLY WITH SUCH A MIND AS YOU WOULD GO TO A LEARNED MAN EXPERIENCED IN THE SCRIPTURE, AS ONE THAT CAN SPEAK COMFORTABLE, QUIETING WORDS TO YOU, BUT AS ONE THAT HATH AUTHORITY DELEGATED TO HIM FROM GOD HIMSELF TO ABSOLVE AND ACQUIT YOU OF YOUR SINS." *Chillingworth's Works*, vol. iii., p. 206. London, 1820, Sermon 7.

The times in which Chillingworth lived were much given to controversy. He became unsettled in his views while at Oxford and was finally converted to Roman Catholicism by Fisher, but was induced by Laud to return from Douay, whither he had gone, to Oxford, and re-examine the question. This resulted in his return to his old allegiance to the English Church. The sermon, quoted from above, was preached after his return. Chillingworth died in 1644.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says, speaking of confession: "It is a very pious preparation to the Holy Sacrament that we confess our sins to the Minister of religion." . . . *Works*, vol. ix., p. 299. London, 1828.

And again he writes: "But the priest's proper power of absolving (which is in no case communicable to any man who is not consecrated to the Ministry) is a giving the penitent the means of eternal pardon, the admitting him to the Sacraments of the Church, and the peace and communion of the faithful; because this is the only way really to obtain pardon of God; there being in ordinary no way to heaven but by serving God in the way which He hath commanded us by His Son, that is, in the way of the Church, which is His Body, whereof He is Prince and Head." *Vol. ix.*, p. 258. Jeremy Taylor died in 1667.

In the "*Guide for the Penitent*," p. 113, London, 1761, written either by Jeremy Taylor or Bishop Duppa, and united with Taylor's "*Golden Grove*," under advice concern-

ing Confession, we read: "That besides this Examination of your conscience which may be done in secret between God and your own soul, there is great use of Holy Confession; which though it be not generally in all cases, and peremptorily commanded, as if without it no salvation could possibly be had; yet you are advised by the Church under whose discipline you live, that before you are to receive the Holy Sacrament or when you are visited with any dangerous sickness, if you find any one particular sin, or more, that lies heavy upon you, to disburden yourself of it into the bosom of your Confessor, who not only stands between God and you to pray for you, but hath the power of the Keys committed to him, upon your true repentance to absolve you in Christ's name for those sins which you have confessed to him."

And Bishop Cosin, who took the leading part in the last revision of the English Prayer-Book (1662), in his "*Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*," commenting on the rubric in the Visitation Office, "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession," etc., writes: "The Church of England, howsoever it holdeth not Confession and Absolution Sacramental, that is, made unto and received from a Priest, TO BE SO ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY AS THAT WITHOUT IT THERE CAN BE NO REMISSION OF SINS; yet by this place it is manifest what she teacheth concerning the virtue and force of this sacred action. The Confession is commanded to be special. The Absolution is the same that the ancient Church and the present Church of Rome useth. . . . Our 'if he feel his conscience troubled' is no more than his 'if he find out his sins' ('si inveniatur peccata'); for if he be not troubled with sin, what needs either Confession or Absolution? Venial sins that separate not from the grace of God need not so much to trouble a man's conscience. If he hath com-

mitted any mortal sin then we require confession of it to a priest, who may give him upon his true contrition and repentance the benefit of absolution, which takes effect according to his disposition that is absolved. . . . The truth is, that in the Priest's absolution there is the true power and virtue of forgiveness, which will most certainly take effect, 'unless an obstacle is imposed,' as in Baptism." *Anglo-Catholic Library. Cosin's Works, vol. v., p. 163.* Cosin died 1672.

Commenting on the same rubric Dr. John Henry Blunt in "*The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*," p. 466, *revised and enlarged edition*, Dutton, 1884, says: "It is plain that the kind of Confession named in the Rubric is that which is commonly known as 'Auricular Confession'; for although privacy is not enjoined, it is quite certain that it would be sought both by Priest and penitent, and that without it the Confession would most likely be of a very general, instead of a 'special' character. That it is also intended to be private or 'auricular'—spoken to the ear of the Priest alone—is shown by the original form of the Rubric in 1549, which speaks of 'all private confessions' with an evidently inclusive sense—this here enjoined being one of the kind included." Blunt died only a few years ago.

Archbishop Wake, the author of various books against the errors of the Church of Rome, writes: "The Church of England refuses no sort of Confession either public or private, which may be any way necessary to the quieting of men's consciences, or to the exercise of that power which our Saviour Christ has left to His Church.

"We have our penitential canon for public offenders; we exhort men, if they have the least doubt or scruple, nay sometimes though they have none, but specially before they receive the Holy Sacrament to confess their

sins. We propose to them the benefit not only of ghostly advice how to manage their repentance, but the great comfort of absolution too, as soon as they have completed it. . . . When we visit our sick, we never fail to exhort them to make a special confession of their sins to him that ministers to them; and when they have done it, their absolution is so full that the Church of Rome itself could not desire to add anything to it." *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, in Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. xii., p. 107.* Archbishop Wake died 1737.

And Wheatly in "*A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*," p. 375, in his dissertation on the Visitation Office says: "And therefore the Church of England at the Reformation, in the particular now before us, freed it from all encroachments with which the Church of Rome had embarrassed it, and reduced confession to its primitive plan. She neither calls it a Sacrament, nor requires it to be used as universally necessary; BUT BECAUSE IT IS REQUISITE THAT NO MAN SHOULD COME TO THE HOLY COMMUNION, BUT WITH A FULL TRUST IN GOD'S MERCY, AND WITH A QUIET CONSCIENCE; SHE THEREFORE ADVISES, THAT IF THERE BE ANY WHO IS NOT ABLE TO QUIET HIS OWN CONSCIENCE, BUT REQUIRETH FURTHER COMFORT OR COUNSEL, HE SHOULD COME TO HIS OWN, OR TO SOME OTHER DISCREET AND LEARNED MINISTER OF GOD'S WORD, AND OPEN HIS GRIEF, THAT, BY THE MINISTRY OF GOD'S HOLY WORD, HE MAY RECEIVE THE BENEFIT OF ABSOLUTION, TOGETHER WITH GHOSTLY COUNSEL AND ADVICE, TO THE QUIETING OF HIS CONSCIENCE, AND AVOIDING OF ALL SCRUPLES AND DOUBTFULNESS.

"So that we may still, I presume, wish very consistently with the determination of our Church, that our people would apply themselves oftener than they do to their

spiritual physicians, even in the time of their health, since it is much to be feared they are wounded oftener than they complain, and yet, through aversion of disclosing their sore, suffer it to gangrene for want of their help who should work the cure." Wheatly died in 1742.

Wilson, the saintly Bishop of Sodor and Man, writes: "And they that are sick and have any faith in God's Word, will, as St. James advises send for the Minister of God: that he may pray over him, that he may examine the sincerity of his faith and his repentance, and that, if he is truly penitent, he may receive absolution, which the Spirit of God assures him shall have a real effect." *Anglo-Catholic Library. Wilson's Works, vol. iii., p. 416.* Bishop Wilson died in 1755.

Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester says in his "*Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*," p. 595, Dutton, 1890: "Thus the Church of England provides for all troubled consciences the power of relieving themselves, by making confession of guilt to their pastor, or 'any other discreet and learned minister,' and so gives them comfort and counsel, but does not bind every one of necessity to rehearse all his private sins to man, nor elevate such useful confession into a sacrament essential to salvation."

And Bishop Moberly of Salisbury, the immediate predecessor of the present Bishop, writes: "We have still the offer (Oh! that we would think of it more readily, and use it oftener) of the benefit of Absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of the Conscience." "*The Great Forty Days*," p. 135.

Sir W. Palmer in his "*Treatise on the Church of Christ*," vol. i., p. 518, 2d ed., London, a work authorized as a textbook in seminaries of the American Church, says: "The practice of private confession to priests, and absolution, she never abolished. . . . That the Church did not mean

to abolish Confession and Absolution (which she even regards as a sort of Sacrament) in general, appears from the Office of the Eucharist, and from the Visitation of the Sick, then drawn up; and from the power conferred on Priests in the ordination services. The Homilies drawn up in 1562, only declared this Confession and Absolution not essential generally to the pardon of sin, but this does not militate against its desirableness and benefit which the Church never denied. We only disused the Canon, 'omnes utriusque sexus' made by the Synod of Lateran in 1215; and for good reasons restored the practice of confession to the state it was in previously, when it was not enjoined at a particular time of every year. The alteration was only in a matter of changeable discipline."

And in the *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, p. 142, 2d ed., Blunt, under the head of Confession we read: "Although the canons of the mediæval Church of England respecting confession were not actually repealed, their compulsory force may be said to have lapsed during the Reformation period; and (without any word indeed depreciating the value of confession) the Church of England habitually reverted to the earlier system of voluntary confession. The authoritative Anglican statements and injunctions respecting it will be found in the third of the Ten Articles of A. D. 1536; in The Institution of a Christian Man, and its revised form, The Erudition for any Christian Man; in the Exhortation to Communion, and the office for the Visitation of the Sick, contained in the various editions of the Book of Common Prayer from A. D. 1549 to A. D. 1662, and in the 113th of the Canons of A. D. 1603. From these documents it will be found that the ancient system of 'auricular' or private confession is still permitted, and in some cases encouraged;


and that, beyond the disuse of any words which would imply its absolute necessity to salvation, there is nothing that breaks into the ancient traditions of the Church upon the subject. The opinion of all those divines, who have best expressed the theology of the Church of England as distinguished from that of the Dissenters, have also invariably run in the same direction, from the time of Hooker to that of Keble."

Quotations to the same effect might be multiplied almost indefinitely. Suffice it, however, to mention the names of a few distinguished prelates and theologians who either simply recommended or both recommended and practised confession: Bishop Andrewes, the author of the *Answer to Cardinal Bellarmine*; Bishop White, author of the *Reply to Fisher*; Dr. Isaac Barrow, author of a *Treatise against the Supremacy of the Pope*; Bishop Sparrow, one of the Savoy Commissioners; Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Berkeley, Bishop Horne, Bishop Pearson, author of the *Exposition of the Creed*; also Heylin, Bishop Ken, Archbishop Sharp, author of "*Sermons against Popery*," Bishop Hall, author of "*No Peace with Rome*," Bishop Forbes, Isaac Williams, Bishop Grey, Bishop Milman, Keble, Pusey, Charles Marriott, and Liddon.

The American Church speaking by her formularies teaches the same doctrine of Penance that the Church of England does. Besides her general adherence to the doctrine and discipline of that Church declared in the Preface of the Book of Common Prayer, she expressly inculcates the practice of penance. She recommends it wherever the Church of England does. In one case she absolutely requires it: the case of excommunicated persons seeking to be reconciled to the Church.

The XXXIII Article of Religion reads as follows :

"That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the Unity of the Church and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto." Commenting on this Article Bishop Harold Browne writes: "The Church of England is clear enough in its principles though restrained in her practice. This Article speaks plainly her doctrine." *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 773.



It seems scarcely necessary to say that the Church Club is not responsible for any individual opinions on points, not ruled by the Church, which, the learned theologians who have been good enough to lecture under its auspices, may have expressed.